

of pay within the meaning of the act and that overtime payments by defendant to plaintiffs were overtime compensation within the meaning of the act; and as a result thereof and pursuant to the provisions of section 9 of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947, this defendant is not liable to plaintiffs, or any of them, for any of the acts or omissions complained of in this action.

#### *Ninth defense*

The acts or omissions, and each of them, of this defendant, complained of by plaintiffs, and each of them, in this action were in good faith in conformity with and in reliance on that certain administrative ruling, approval, and interpretation known as Interpretative Bulletin No. 4 issued by the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor; and as a result thereof and pursuant to the provisions of section 9 of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947, this defendant is not liable to plaintiffs, or any of them, for any of the acts or omissions complained of in this action.

#### *Tenth defense*

The acts or omissions, and each of them, of this defendant, complained of by plaintiffs, and each of them, in this action were in good faith in conformity with and in reliance on the administrative practice and enforcement policy of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor, with respect to the class of employers to which this defendant now belongs and has belonged for all times mentioned in this action; and as a result thereof and pursuant to the provisions of section 9 of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947, this defendant is not liable to plaintiffs, or any of them, for any of the acts or omissions complained of in this action.

#### *Eleventh defense*

Defendant refers to the allegations in the eighth, ninth, and tenth defense of this answer and incorporates said allegations in this defense by reference.

The acts or omissions, and each of them, by this defendant, giving rise to this action were in good faith, and this defendant at all of the times mentioned in this action had reasonable grounds for believing that the acts and omissions, and each of them, if any, of this defendant were not a violation or violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and for this reason the court in the exercise of the discretion vested in it by the provisions of section 11 of the Portal to Portal Act of 1947 should award no liquidated damages to plaintiffs or either of them.

This motion is made upon the ground that the foregoing defenses are authorized by the Portal to Portal Act of 1947, approved May 14, 1947, and are part of this defendant's defense to this action.

Dated May 19, 1947.

FRANK J. HENNESSY,  
JOHN F. SONNETT,  
J. FRANCIS HAYDEN,  
MARVIN C. TAYLOR,  
*Attorneys for This Defendant.*

#### **EXHIBIT B**

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SOUTHERN  
DIVISION—CASTAGNASSO, PLAINTIFFS, V. PARR  
RICHMOND, DEFENDANT, NO. 25302-H

(Motion of defendant, Parr Richmond, to amend answer)

Defendant above named moves the court to amend the answer on file in the above action by striking therefrom the amendments thereto allowed by the court on May 22, 1947, and substituting therefor the following:

#### *Eighth defense*

This defendant alleges, as a defense under section 9 of the Portal to Portal Act of 1947, that it believed that, in respect of all cargoes where the overtime rates established by the

collective bargaining contracts in effect during the period in suit were  $1\frac{1}{2}$  times the straight time rates established by the contracts for such cargoes, the contract straight time rates were the regular rates for handling such cargoes within the meaning of those words in the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and that payments at such contract overtime rates for handling such cargoes fully discharged all its obligations under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 for handling such cargoes. This defendant paid the plaintiffs in accordance with this belief. This belief, and payment in accordance therewith, were in good faith in conformity with and in reliance on the administrative ruling, approval, and interpretation of the Wage and Hour Division through its administrator, its regional director, and its regional attorney in 1938 and in conformity with and in reliance on the regulations, rulings, and interpretations contained in the Wage and Hour Division's Interpretive Bulletin No. 4. Wherefore this defendant says that by virtue of the provisions of section 9 of the Portal to Portal Act of 1947 it is not subject to any liability under the Fair Labor Standards Act for failure to pay compensation for handling such cargoes on any other basis.

#### *Ninth defense*

This defendant says that it paid the plaintiffs in accordance with the terms of the collective-bargaining contracts in effect during the period in suit, except that in certain instances it paid the plaintiffs more overtime than the contracts called for—that is to say, whenever in any workweek a plaintiff had worked 40 straight-time hours and thereafter performed further work in periods which, under the contracts, called only for payment at straight-time rates, this defendant paid for such work at contract overtime rates because it believed that it was required to do so by the Fair Labor Standards Act. This defendant alleges that it believed in good faith and on reasonable grounds that payment as above stated was not a violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act, but on the contrary was a full compliance with its requirements. Wherefore this defendant prays that the court, in the exercise of the discretion vested in it by section 11 of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947, award no liquidated damages against this defendant in the event that it finds and rules that such payments fell short of full compliance with this defendant's obligations under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

This motion is made upon the ground that the foregoing defenses are authorized by the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947, approved May 14, 1947, and are part of this defendant's defense to this action.

Dated May 27, 1947.

FRANK J. HENNESSY,  
PEYTON FORD,  
J. FRANCIS HAYDEN,  
MARVIN C. TAYLOR,  
*Attorneys for This Defendant.*

#### **RECESS**

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.), as in executive session, the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 4, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### **CONFIRMATIONS**

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 3 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

#### **DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

Peyton Ford to be an Assistant Attorney General.

#### **UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES**

ROBERT EWING THOMASON to be United States district judge for the western district of Texas.

Albert V. Bryan to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Virginia.

## **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

TUESDAY, JUNE 3, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HALLECK.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the wise may bring their learning and the wealthy their riches, but we would bring the gifts which the poorest may offer, an honest and a contrite heart. Lord God, help us each day to hold fast these richest of offerings.

As we approach our labor, may it find us renewed in vigor and unafraid. O put us in league with all that is excellent and which knows no compromise or expediency, turning from any truanis who fail in the way of uprightness and honesty of purpose. Deeper than we have known and clearer than we have seen, do Thou reveal and impress us with our responsibility and social duty, which demands that a public office is a public trust. As guardians of truth, of honor, and human rights, may we ever protect the sanctity of liberty, of peace, and the right to work. Break down the walls that separate men and enable them to serve one another.

For our Master's sake, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### **MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE**

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2436. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CORDON, Mr. REED, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. MCKELLAR, and Mr. HAYDEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3203. An act relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference

with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BUCK, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. CAIN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and Mr. TAYLOR to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILSON of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Bedford Daily Times-Mail.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a syndicated article on the labor conference report by David Lawrence and in the other to include an article from Aviation News of May 12.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUTLER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

#### LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, there have been various suggestions to the House as to what the President might do in respect to certain legislation. Last night I took occasion to read through the conference committee print on the labor bill which we will probably have up for consideration and action tomorrow.

I want to say just this: That if any political lieutenants of the President or any so-called leaders of labor brandish old hackneyed phrases about vicious or drastic labor legislation, and browbeat the President into vetoing this bill as it now comes to us, the American people will have witnessed a bunch of gangsters entering the White House and holding up the President with a wooden gun.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Then I would like to have the gentleman explain how they "browbeat" the House conferees into accepting the Senate version.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Well, I think the only reason that somebody suggested was that they had to do something like that to try to get it through the White House. The gentleman should remember that the conferees are accepting the bill, not vetoing it. The bill has

some values, but it definitely is not an antilabor bill and certainly he will be scared of a shadow who fears to accept it on that ground.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I trust that before the President acts on this bill he be allowed to see what it is. It is my understanding that the conference report is coming up in the House tomorrow, and if it has been printed yet, I cannot find a copy of it. It was not filed last night. It will probably be filed tonight, and we will get to our offices tomorrow at 7:30 or 9:30 or 10:30, and we may have a copy of the conference report then, which we are supposed to vote on soon after 12 o'clock. Frankly, I have been around here a good while, and I would like to know what is in this conference report before I vote upon it. Now, there is a committee print being circulated around here of what is supposed to be the bill, but no conference report is available to anybody. I would like to see what the statement of the managers on the part of the House and the Senate about this bill is before I vote on it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include the second broadcast by our late colleague, the Honorable Fred Bradley, dealing with the Panama Canal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Washington Times-Herald.

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Long Beach Independent.

#### THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am like the minority leader. I do not know what is in this conference report yet. But this is not the first time that I have been placed in such a position. For the last 10 or 12 years we have been in the same position when he was Speaker of the House. Time after time after time the Democratic House committees brought in conference reports and we were supposed to vote on them without

any time at all for study. Now you have been notified the report will be ready tomorrow morning and you can look them over 4 hours before you have to vote on the conference report.

But, I want to call the attention of the minority leader to the Treasury statement of May 27, showing that the national debt at that time was \$258,304,565,000. Who is responsible for that condition? For 15 years the Democrats and New Dealers have been building this debt up until we have now the greatest national debt that this country has ever known. We are going to have the toughest time we ever had if we do not cut down expenses now and try to balance the budget and try to reduce this debt that they have built up.

In 1940 we appropriated for the Interior Department \$71,000,000—now it takes \$600,000,000. It cost \$18,000,000 to run the Department of Labor in 1940, for 1948 they want \$356,000,000 for the Labor Department. Other departments of Government are just as exorbitant in expenditures. Let us look at the personnel. The Department of State had 5,400 employees in 1939. They want money enough today to employ over 25,000 employees. The Department of Justice employed over 19,000 people in 1941. They now want to employ over 23,000 employees. The Department of Commerce employed 14,000 people before the war; now they want to employ over 40,000 employees. Is it any wonder we Republicans want to cut down expenses of Government and lay off employees. The taxpayers and voters gave us a mandate to do the job. Let us do it.

#### SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1135) to extend for 1 year certain provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 5 years, for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what this is all about.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I may say to the gentleman that this simply extends for 1 year the provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 5 years. The present bill expires at the end of this month. Under the decentralization plan there are 1,468 branch regional, sub-regional, and other offices. These field offices are quartered in 1,685 separate buildings.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is this something General Bradley wants?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. He has asked for it by letter to the Speaker of the House. It has the approval of the Budget. Our Committee on Veterans' Affairs reported the bill out unanimously.



I have asked to take up the Senate bill as the Senate already has passed the bill unanimously, and time is so important.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, has this problem been taken up with the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds? Do not they have something to do with the providing of space in the District of Columbia?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand General Bradley has done everything possible along that line with all the various departments.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I do not recall its having come up. I should like to know what they are using the space for that they already have, how much of that space is being utilized for concessions and being rented out to private enterprise, and how much money the Veterans' Administration is getting from the rental of space that the taxpayers are giving them, and using that to subsidize their cafeterias as they are doing in the Pentagon.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The general has assured us that this is not anything that is not necessary.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I am afraid we should know more about this matter before it passes in this manner. I am going to have to object to the consideration of the bill at this time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman not allow it to go through? It will be more expensive, probably, if this bill is not passed promptly. The present bill expires the end of the month.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I think the bill may well be held over another day. We are receiving from Woodward & Lothrop and from Walgreen's drug store a million dollars. That is received by the War Department in the Pentagon. Yet they are occupying space in 17 other buildings, and that money is going to subsidize the employees over there to pay for their food, \$1,000,000.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I say to the gentleman that most of these facilities are not in the city of Washington. They are scattered all over the country.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Would the gentleman object to holding this up for one more day?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If the gentleman wishes to object, that is his privilege.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I should like to have one more day, until we can learn more about this.

Mr. PHILLIPS. If the gentleman will yield, may I ask the gentleman if she has a list of these facilities?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I do not have the list here.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Could that be inserted in the Record so that, if the gentleman objects and the bill is held over, the Members may have an opportunity to see that list?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very sure that could be secured, and I shall be very glad to insert it.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Can the gentleman tell me why this bill did not

come before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I do not think it has been the custom to bring these things before that committee. I know General Bradley has gone to all the various departments and asked what they could give him in the way of space. I know that from past experience.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Will the gentleman withdraw her request until tomorrow?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman has reserved the right to object. If he objects to it today, that settles it.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Then I am going to have to object, Mr. Speaker.

#### CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on tomorrow, Calendar Wednesday, be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an article by Mark Sullivan on the subject of the wool bill, which appeared in the Washington Post.

Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a speech he made on Memorial Day.

Mr. SMATHERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances and include editorials.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include an analysis of the Taft-Hartley bill as reported by the committee of conference. This may exceed the limit by a page or two, but I ask that despite that fact I may be permitted to include it in my remarks.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, whose analysis is it?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. It is by Mr. Lee Pressman, general counsel of the CIO.

Mr. RANKIN. Do you not think it would be better to insert the report of the conferees in the Record instead of having the CIO come in and insert its criticism at extra expense to the Government?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a radio address.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk

and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted I may address the House for 5 minutes today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BATTLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a Memorial Day address.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in regard to a bill he is introducing today.

#### OLD-AGE SECURITY

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most inspiring parts of our Constitution is contained in the preamble which guarantees to all citizens the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Yet, when men and women, 9 out of 10 of them in this country, reach the age of 60, they are unable to pursue that happiness because of limited means or the lack of wherewithal.

Therefore, I am advocating immediate consideration and passage of a universal old-age pension plan such as the one outlined by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] in his bill, H. R. 16. This is popularly known as the Townsend plan. Our hope is that not just one group or a few will be included in our social-security system, but all groups regardless of race, religion, or color, and regardless of occupation. All citizens of the land should have the opportunity to enjoy the fruits of a well-earned retirement and the results of all their productive years so that they can live happily in their old age.

We can successfully fight off communism by making our American system work. The most natural desire of everyone is to have security in his declining years. Reasonable retirement for all is the answer, especially when such retirement is actuarially sound.

The millions of Americans who have reached 60 or who are approaching this ripe age deserve consideration. They have the right to anticipate their brightest days to come.

With security guaranteed, they can emulate the experience of Rabbi Ben Ezra who in his wisdom said in Browning's poem:

Grow old along with me!  
The best is yet to be,  
The last of life, for which  
The first was made.

#### THE SUGAR SITUATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to

revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter I have written to the Department of Agriculture regarding the sugar situation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am working again trying to get the Secretary of Agriculture to make sugar available for the housewives so that they can do their canning.

I said in part of a letter which I wrote to the Secretary of Agriculture:

Unless action is taken immediately by your Department and permit the use of some of the sugar by releasing the rigid restrictions for the purchase of it, we soon will hear of the destruction of sugar similar to the recent destruction of tons of food potatoes because of foolish bungling. Housewives in angry, protesting letters are daily asking why sugar is not available to preserve surplus food in their homes and factories, as was always their custom before the restrictive regulations.

I will say that even with the regulations the housewives in the past have been allowed a certain amount of sugar with which they may can.

The letter reads further:

Your Department should immediately make additional sugar available for canning and preserving in order to save tons and tons of food now available.

The letter in full is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D. C., June 3, 1947.  
Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,  
Secretary of Agriculture,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to you again asking that you make additional sugar available to persons, families, and industrial users in the United States. From daily reports throughout the world enormous supplies of sugar are available, warehouses are full and overflowing, sugar is piling up on the docks, and transportation will soon be unable to handle the tremendous supply. Unless action is taken immediately by your Department to permit the use of some of this sugar by releasing the rigid restrictions for the purchase of it, we soon will hear of destruction of the sugar similar to the recent destruction of tons of food potatoes because of foolish bungling.

The press in sensible, logical editorials, housewives in long, angry, protesting letters, daily ask why sugar is not available for preserving their surplus food in the homes and the factories, as was always their custom before these restrictive regulations. Your Department should immediately make additional sugar available for canning and preserving in order to save the tons and tons of food now available and becoming available in increasing amounts each day. To permit the waste of this crop of sugar with the hordes of starving peoples throughout the world is criminal. Unless action is taken immediately by your Department to grant additional sugar for canning and preserving surplus foods, I shall ask the Congress to take the necessary action.

Very sincerely yours,

(Mrs. John Jacob Rogers).

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, since today is the birthday of Jefferson Davis, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Bishop Galloway.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

#### FORMER SECRETARY BYRNES AND THE MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I was very much surprised if not shocked to read a United Press report this morning that the film industry has employed former Secretary of State Byrnes to represent it before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. Eric Johnston, president of the film industry or the Motion Picture Producers Association, announces:

Byrnes' first assignment will be to champion the screen's freedom of expression before the House Committee on Un-American Activities which opens a public hearing on the film industry in Washington this month. We are determined—

Said Johnston—

that subversive propaganda, Government pressure, or political censorship will never undermine freedom of the screen.

Mr. Speaker, the American people today are beginning to learn where this Communist propaganda in our motion-picture industry comes from, and the House Committee on Un-American Activities is not going to be intimidated in its effort to expose the Communist propaganda in motion pictures and to bring out legislation to stop it.

The "freedom of the screen," as Mr. Johnston calls it, does not surpass in importance the protection of American institutions, or the protection of the children of this country against the insidious poisons carried by many of these pictures.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

#### THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is the day for the call of the Private Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill.

#### DIXIE MARGARINE CO.

The Clerk called the first bill (H. R. 354) for the relief of the Dixie Margarine Co., a Tennessee corporation, of Memphis, Tenn.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin and Mr. POTTS objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### LT. COL. ORVILLE E. MCKIM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 559) for the relief of Lt. Col. Orville E. McKim.

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### MARY LOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1742) for the relief of Mary Lomas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 19 (a) of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 889-890; 54 Stat. 1044; 8 U. S. C. 155), the Attorney General is authorized and directed to permit Mary Lomas, of Fairmont, W. Va., to remain permanently in the United States if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than quotas.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the period insert "Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Greece of the first year that the said quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MRS. INGA PATTERSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1152) for the relief of Mrs. Inga Patterson, widow of F. X. Patterson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,375 to Mrs. Inga Patterson, widow of F. X. Patterson, of Washington, D. C., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for expenses incurred as a result of condemnation proceedings involving property of the said F. X. Patterson, Anacostia Road SE., Washington, D. C.: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### NATURALIZATION OF CERTAIN UNITED STATES ARMY PERSONNEL—YUGOSLAV FLIERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1652) to provide for the naturalization of certain United States Army personnel—Yugoslav fliers.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

#### JAMES HARRY MARTIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 617) for the relief of James Harry Martin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That James Harry Martin, of Pontiac, Mich., be permitted to file an application with the Secretary of War for benefits under the World War Adjusted Com-



pensation Act, as amended, on or before January 1, 1948, any time limit in such act for filing such an application to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POTTS: On page 1, line 6, after the words "on or before", strike out "January 1, 1948" and insert in lieu thereof "July 1, 1949."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ALLIED AVIATION CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 631) for the relief of the Allied Aviation Corp. There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Allied Aviation Corp., of Cockeysville, Md., the sum of \$234,195.20 with interest thereon from November 1, 1943, to the date of payment, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for costs incurred and losses sustained in the creation and production of experimental amphibious gliders for the Navy Department in the prosecution of the war, the said costs and losses having been occasioned primarily by reason of the corporation's reliance upon representations, commitments, and assurances made in good faith by agents of and on behalf of the Government but which were not fulfilled: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the prosecution and collection of this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$234,195.20 with interest thereon from November 1, 1943, to the date of payment" and insert in lieu thereof "\$108,753.13."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MARVIN PETTUS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 637) for the relief of Marvin Pettus.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Marvin Pettus, of Mansfield, Ark., the sum of \$5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries sustained and damages suffered by him as result of being struck by an Army vehicle operated by Army personnel on the camp ground of Camp Chaffee, Ark., on the 15th

day of December 1944, and said injuries having been caused by the negligent operation of said Army vehicle so as to cause it to run into the vehicle in which the said Marvin Pettus was riding: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$1,536."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I object.  
Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair may say to the objectors that the question was put as to whether there was objection to the present consideration of the bill, and no objection was heard.

The question recurs on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.  
The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### J. DON ALEXANDER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 813) for the relief of J. Don Alexander.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. POTTS objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommended to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ESTATE OF ABRAM BANTA BOGERT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 837) for the relief of the estate of Abram Banta Bogert.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of the late Abram Banta Bogert the sum of \$8,217.65, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the personal injury, hospital and medical expenses, loss of earnings, property damage, and death of the said Abram Banta Bogert, as the result of an accident involving a United States Army truck driven by John G. Walter, Company D, One Hundred and Twenty-eighth Ordnance, Pine Camp, N. Y., on Route 9W in the town of Saugerties, Ulster County, N. Y., near pole No. 1515, about 4 miles north of the village of Saugerties, at about 4 o'clock on the afternoon of February 26, 1943: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment.

Page 1, line 6, after the name "Bogert", strike out the bill down to the colon in line 5, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof "deceased, the sum of \$6,117.65, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injury and death of the said Abram Banta Bogert, Saugerties, N. Y., the medical, hospital, and burial expenses incurred by reason of such injury and death, and the property damage sustained as a result of an accident involving an Army truck, which occurred on Route 9-W near Saugerties, N. Y., on February 26, 1943."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LORENZO H. FROMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 987) for the relief of Lorenzo H. Froman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That Lorenzo H. Froman, former owner of a certain farm consisting of 165 acres of land, more or less, near Camp Knox, in Hardin County, Ky., is, as such former owner, hereby authorized to bring suit against the United States of America to recover damages, if any, for loss or losses which he may have sustained or suffered, as such owner, by reason of establishment, construction, or maintenance of Camp Knox in the State of Kentucky. Jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky to hear, consider, determine, and render judgment for the amount of any such damages, if any, as may be found to have been sustained or suffered by the said former owner of said farm, with the same right of appeal as in other cases, and notwithstanding any lapse of time or statute of limitations: *Provided,* That such action will be brought within 1 year from the date that this act shall become effective.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ESTATE OF NORMAN C. COBB ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 993) for the relief of the estate of Norman C. Cobb, Naomi R. Cobb, and Garland L. Cobb.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$25,000 to the estate of Norman C. Cobb, Naomi R. Cobb, and Garland L. Cobb, late of Topeka, Kans., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the deaths of the said Norman C. Cobb, Naomi R. Cobb, and Garland L. Cobb, sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States Army plane, when it crashed into the house in which they were located, in Memphis, Tenn., on April 29, 1944: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the dollar sign strike out "\$25,000, to the estate of Norman C. Cobb, Naomi R. Cobb, and Garland L. Cobb", and insert in lieu thereof "5,000 to the estate of Norman C. Cobb, the sum of \$5,000 to the estate of Naomi R. Cobb, and the sum of \$2,000 to the estate of Garland L. Cobb". Page 2, line 3, after the words "sustained as" strike out "the result of an accident involving a United States Army plane, when it crashed into the house in which they were located, in Memphis, Tenn., on April 29, 1944" and insert in lieu thereof "a result of the crash of a United States Army airplane into the house in which they resided, in Memphis, Tenn., on April 29, 1944."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAMUEL W. DAVIS, JR., ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1144) for the relief of Samuel W. Davis, Jr.; Mrs. Samuel W. Davis, Jr.; and Betty Jane Davis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each of the following named persons, residents of Greensboro, N. C., the amount specified in the case of such person, in full satisfaction of his or her claim against the United States for the personal injury and other damage indicated in each case resulting from a collision between a United States Army vehicle and an automobile driven by the claimant, Samuel W. Davis, Jr., in which other claimants were passengers, near the town of Creedmoor, N. C., on December 26, 1944:

Samuel W. Davis, Jr., for personal injuries, medical expenses for his own injuries and those of his wife and daughter, and damage to automobile, in the total sum of \$55,518.88;

Mrs. Samuel W. Davis, Jr., for personal injuries in the sum of \$10,000;

Legal guardian of Betty Jane Davis, a minor, for personal injuries, in the sum of \$5,000: *Provided*, That no part of any sum appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim satisfied by the payment of such sum, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "appropriated", strike out the bill down to the colon in line 11, page 2. Insert in lieu thereof "the sum of \$18,518 to Samuel W. Davis, Jr., of Greensboro, N. C., for personal injuries and loss of earnings sustained by him and for medical and hospital expenses incurred by him on account of his injuries and those of his wife, Mrs. Samuel W. Davis, Jr., and his minor daughter, Betty Jane Davis, and for future medical and hospital expenses for their treatment; the sum of \$4,000 to the said Mrs. Samuel W. Davis, Jr., for personal injuries sustained by her; and the sum of \$3,000 to the legal guardian of the said Betty Jane Davis, a minor, for the personal injuries sustained by said minor, in full settlement of all claims of the said Samuel W.

Davis, Jr., Mrs. Samuel W. Davis, Jr., and Betty Jane Davis, against the United States arising out of an accident which occurred on December 26, 1944, on United States Highway No. 15, near Creedmoor, N. C., involving an Army truck."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSIS M. NICHOLS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1162) for the relief of Persis M. Nichols.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

ESTATE OF GEORGE W. COOMBS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1497) for the relief of the estate of George W. Coombs.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of George W. Coombs, deceased, the sum of \$600 as reimbursement of a like amount improperly collected from the said George W. Coombs while serving as postal superintendent of Inwood station, New York City: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. LULA WILSON NEVERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1508) for the relief of Mrs. Lula Wilson Nevers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

WILLIAM P. GILLINGHAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1531) for the relief of William P. Gillingham.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William P. Gillingham, Big Bear Lake, Calif., the sum of \$5,321. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said William

P. Gillingham v. The United States on account of the death of his wife, Elizabeth S. Gillingham, resulting from personal injuries sustained on February 1, 1943, when an automobile in which she was riding collided with a United States Army truck on United States Highway No. 66 at Devore, Calif.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NORMAN THORESON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1658) for the relief of Norman Thoreson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Norman Thoreson, Pasco, Wash., the sum of \$7,472.20. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Norman Thoreson against the United States as the result of damage to grazing land, such damage being caused by fire, June 5, 1944, resulting from practice-bombing operations of Navy planes from the Pasco Naval Air Station: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$7,472.20" and insert "\$3,202.88."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVA L. DUDLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1799) for the relief of Eva L. Dudley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Eva L. Dudley, of St. Petersburg, Fla., the sum of \$2,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage, personal injuries, hospital, and medical expenses sustained as a result of an automobile accident, on November 26, 1943, caused by a United States Veterans' Administration fire truck near the main gate of the Bay Pines Veterans' Administration Hospital, on United States Highway No. 19, Bay Pines, Fla.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection



with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Page 1, line 6, after the sum "\$2,000", insert "pay to Grace M. Collins, of Lima, Ohio, the sum of \$2,000, and pay to Guy B. Slater, of Ada, Ohio, the sum of \$2,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read as follows: "For the relief of Eva L. Dudley, Grace M. Collins, and Guy B. Slater."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A. J. DAVIS, ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1851) for the relief of A. J. Davis, Mrs. Lorene Griffin, Earle Griffin, and Harry Musgrove.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to A. J. Davis, the sum of \$575, for loss of automobile; to Mrs. Lorene Griffin, the sum of \$500, for personal injuries and the sum of \$42.75 for hospital and medical expenses; to Earle Griffin, the sum of \$500, for personal injuries and the sum of \$135.50 for hospital and medical expenses; and to Harry Musgrove, the sum of \$7,500, for personal injuries and the sum of \$475 for hospital and medical expenses, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries received by them on November 25 or 26, 1944, when the car owned by A. J. Davis and operated by Harry Musgrove and occupied by Mrs. Lorene Griffin and Earle Griffin, was struck from the rear by a Government-owned car being operated by Cecil Coleman, an employee of the naval stores experiment station, Forestry Service, United States Department of Agriculture, Olusta, Fla.; said accident occurring approximately 1½ miles west of Sanderson, Fla., on United States Highway No. 90: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$575" and insert "\$275."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$500" and insert "\$42.75."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "injuries" strike out the words "and the sum of \$42.75 for."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "\$500" and insert "\$635.50."

Page 1, line 10, strike out the words "and the sum of \$135.50 for."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "\$7,500" and insert "\$2,821."

Page 2, line 2, strike out the words "and the sum of \$475 for."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEW JERSEY, INDIANA & ILLINOIS RAILROAD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2302) for the relief of New Jersey, Indiana & Illinois Railroad.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the New Jersey, Indiana & Illinois Railroad, the sum of \$3,114.34, in full and final satisfaction of all claims against the United States for property damage resulting from the explosions which occurred at the naval ammunition depot at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944, and which has been approved and recommended for payment by the Secretary of the Navy in his report dated September 13, 1945, and entitled "Summary of Reports of the Secretary of the Navy to the Congress of the United States Pursuant to Public Law 423, Seventy-eighth Congress, Second Session, of Claims Resulting From the Explosion Which Occurred at the Naval Ammunition Depot at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRUCE BROS. GRAIN CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3387) for the relief of Bruce Bros. Grain Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$279.90, to the Bruce Bros. Grain Co., in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States to cover loss sustained by said company on a car of wheat, car No. 96110, Chicago, Burlington & Quincy, shipped from St. Joseph, Mo., July 15, 1921, to Minneapolis, Minn.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

R. W. WOOD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3170) for the relief of R. W. Wood.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the

sum of \$106.34 to R. W. Wood, of 1811 D Street NE., Washington, D. C., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for salary not paid while under suspension at Army air base, Key Field, Miss., from January 22, 1944, to January 31, 1944, inclusive, while serving as associate civil engineer and superintendent of construction: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK SCHINDLER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 135) to legalize the admission into the United States of Frank Schindler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Attorney General is hereby directed to record the entry into the United States of Frank Schindler at New York City, N. Y., on June 11, 1939, as a lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws. The Secretary of State shall thereupon reduce by one the immigration quota for Czechoslovakia for the first year that such quota may be available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE ROY STANLEY GEIGER

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Roy Stanley Geiger, lieutenant general, United States Marine Corps, a commission as general, United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That the President is authorized to issue posthumously to the late Roy Stanley Geiger, late a lieutenant general, United States Marine Corps, a commission as general, United States Marine Corps, as of January 23, 1947.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to amend the records of the Navy Department so as to carry the said Roy Stanley Geiger as a general, United States Marine Corps, to rank from January 23, 1947.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPENCER BURGESS DOYLE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1148) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Spencer Burgess Doyle.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the report on this bill did not get to me in time; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That concludes the call of bills on the Private Calendar.

#### COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Banking and Currency may meet this afternoon notwithstanding that the House is in session.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. During general debate?

Mr. WOLCOTT. During general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3678) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; and pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue for the remainder of the day or until such time as there are no further requests for time. I may say I have spoken about this with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], the ranking minority member, and he states there is no objection to the request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand the gentleman's request there will be no occasion to read the bill today?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. We will read the first paragraph today, and, if possible, we would like to pass it.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object if the gentleman will confine his request to general debate here today. The Members leave and they do not know whether the bill will be read for amendment or not.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we will read the first paragraph anyway.

Mr. CANNON. If the reading is confined to the first paragraph there will be no objection to the gentleman's request from this side of the aisle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3678, with Mr. MICHENER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 50 minutes, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain tables compiled by me or under my direction.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am presenting to the House of Representatives on behalf of the Appropriations Committee the military appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948.

The hearings on this bill were opened on February 17 and did not close until April 29, 1947. Four of the seven members of our subcommittee including the chairman are also members of the Deficiency Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which held important meetings during much of the same period that the War Department Subcommittee held hearings on this bill. This delayed us somewhat. I want to express my personal appreciation to every member of my subcommittee for the splendid cooperation I received. It was the most difficult bill which came before this subcommittee during the 11 years during which I have been a Member. I want especially to express my appreciation to my very able and distinguished colleague and former chairman of this committee, the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge JOHN H. KERR. I shall never forget his sympathetic and statesmanlike support and cooperation.

In making savings the committee always had in mind that we were making adequate appropriations for an Army of 1,070,000 officers and men as authorized by law with an Air Corps as planned by the Commander in Chief and the Army. This is in full accord with the over-all request of the War Department and the authorization of the House Military Affairs Committee. The committee is firmly convinced that we should have such an Army. It is equally convinced, in view of the savings we propose, that this Army will be more efficient and effective than before. Inefficiency causes waste; waste causes inefficiency and when you cut off waste you make the Army more efficient. Surplus personnel affects all personnel and makes all personnel less efficient. It encourages a "let Joe do it" policy.

The bill carries a reduction of \$475,809,077 below the budget estimate and rescinds \$1,100,000,000 of 1946 and prior years' appropriations. It reduces civilian employees by 74,631, at a saving of \$184,086,216. It reduces Army officers from 146,000 to approximately 126,000, a reduction of 20,000, at a saving of \$106,250,000. It reduces flying pay \$3,600,000. In all, it takes 94,631 people off the pay roll, at a total saving of \$293,936,216. This, together with other savings, reduces the budget requests by \$475,809,077. The committee did not cut off one enlisted man. It did not take \$1 from the research and development program. It did not cut off 1 of the 18,201 civilian employees engaged in research and development. It did not cut off 1 of the 30,000 employees engaged in and paid out of industrial production funds in our ar-

senals, quartermaster depots, and so forth. It did not cut one Army nurse officer or dietitian from the Army pay roll. The committee did not take \$1 of the pay, clothing allowance, subsistence, rations of one enlisted man or of one necessary officer. The committee wants to be very specific in this phase of the savings made.

Decisions in making these cuts were not always unanimous, of course, the chairman himself being as often in the minority as on the majority side of the votes. Neither were they political. The gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, and especially the ranking member and former chairman, gave me much and valuable support.

I shall now consider the entire budget in detail as far as time will permit. I believe that if you read or listen to my remarks you will agree that the committee made these savings without sacrificing any feature or function necessary to a sound and effective national defense.

#### BIRD'S-EYE VIEW OF ENTIRE WAR DEPARTMENT 1948 APPROPRIATION REQUEST

The following is a bird's-eye view of the entire War Department budget picture as presented to the legislative Joint Budget Committee of the Senate and House of Representatives for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948:

Total appropriation requested	\$7,044,507,100
Total expenditure availability	10,038,327,755
Total estimated expenditures	8,254,658,654

While the amount of expenditure during any one year is limited by the length of time it takes to carry out a definite program and certain other factors, in the final analysis it is the President and not the Congress, the Executive and not the legislative branch of the Government, which determines the speed of the defense program and the actual amount of the expenditures. Witness the fact that it was the President through his Budget Bureau who stopped in a large part the 1947 research and development program of the Army Air Corps as well as the production of airplanes by ordering the Air Corps not to spend \$135,000,000 of the funds appropriated for the present fiscal year. Of this amount, \$75,000,000 was taken from research and development and \$30,000,000 for production of airplanes. In April of this year, when it was too late, according to the testimony, to carry out the program and obligate the money, the President sent a message to Congress asking Congress to transfer this money to "Pay of the Army." Congress did so in view of the testimony that it was too late to obligate it. The same was true with regard to the transfer of \$60,000,000 out of a total of \$100,000,000 Congress appropriated for the National Guard and \$30,000,000 out of \$60,000,000 appropriated for the Organized Reserves.

The testimony shows that the total estimated expenditures are so estimated because the President told the Army that was the amount it could spend during the fiscal year 1948. Summarizing: Total appropriation, \$7,044,507,100; total fixed by the President as amount to be spent,



\$8,254,658,654; total available for expenditure, \$10,038,327,755. Before I proceed further I want to emphasize that the Constitution intended Congress and not the President to control expenditures. This can only be done by having the appropriation budget and expenditure budget as nearly equal as possible and eliminating the tremendous backlog of money available for expenditure from prior years' appropriations.

BILL PROVIDES FOR A RESCISSION OF \$1,100,000,000—1946 AND PRIOR YEARS

The testimony before our committee shows that the War Department still has available \$5,270,883,360 of 1946 and prior years funds, including \$185,000,000 reserved for the possible payment of portal-to-portal pay. Maj. Gen. George T. Richards, War Department Budget Officer, estimated that it would require \$3,700,000,000 to liquidate the obligations still outstanding against these funds.

The Budget Bureau estimated it would require approximately \$3,000,000,000 to liquidate such obligations. On page 171 of the hearings is found the following testimony:

Mr. ENGEL. It has happened that you have \$2,270,000,000 more money than you thought you were going to have.

General RICHARDS. Yes, sir. That is the estimated amount and can be attributed to the aftermath of the war.

Mr. ENGEL. Would not that \$2,270,000,000 be considered as a backlog?

General RICHARDS. The majority would be; yes, sir.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Will you turn that back to the Treasury?

General RICHARDS. We will never draw it from the Treasury?

However the fact is these funds may be drawn from the Treasury. They can only be used for 1946 and prior years' obligations. Since the major part of all war claims against the United States Army, including claims of foreign governments, were incurred for those years and inasmuch as the appropriation bills for those years carried transfer clauses, these funds can and may be and are being used in the settlement of such claims by transferring them to the various services of the Army and they can be used by the State Department for bargaining without any action on the part of Congress. The fact is that if these funds are not rescinded they may be used for such purposes in part or in whole. If they are rescinded they cannot be used. The committee recommends the rescission of \$1,100,000,000 of 1946 and prior years' funds including the \$185,000,000 reserved by the Army for portal-to-portal pay. This will leave adequate funds to meet any legitimate claims that may be filed against the Army for those years.

#### BREAK-DOWN OF WAR DEPARTMENT MILITARY BUDGET

The War Department budget is broken down further into two parts—military and civil functions. Each of these is broken down into two appropriations. The military is broken down into the principal and supplemental estimate. The civil-functions budget is broken down into the regular civil functions, including rivers and harbors, flood control, Panama Canal, and other items usually

appearing in the budget, and in addition we have the item this year for government and relief in occupied areas. Following is a table of the break-down:

A. Military budget now being considered .....	\$5,717,791,500
B. Supplemental estimate to be considered if and when Armed Services Committee authorizes the expenditure further broken down as—	
(a) Engineer service, including construction in overseas possession .....	125,000,000
(b) Construction at military posts in United States .....	100,000,000
(c) Quartermaster Corps, cemeterial expenses .....	54,000,000
Total supplemental estimate .....	279,000,000
Total military budget estimate for fiscal year 1948 .....	5,996,791,500
C. In addition to the above there is a contract authorization for the Air Corps in the amount of .....	280,000,000
Total estimates, including contract authorization .....	6,276,791,500
Civil-functions budget for 1948:	
A. Regular civil-functions estimate, including rivers and harbors, flood control, etc .....	297,691,100
B. Panama Canal .....	25,024,500
C. Relief in occupied areas .....	725,000,000
Total civil-functions budget, including relief in occupied areas .....	1,047,715,600
Total War Department 1948 budget, including contract authorization .....	7,324,507,100

ONLY \$5,717,791,500 OF TOTAL ULTIMATE BUDGET OF \$7,324,507,100 NOW BEFORE HOUSE

Of the total War Department budget of \$7,324,507,100 sent to the Joint Congressional Budget Committee by the President, we have before us only the military part amounting to \$5,717,791,500 plus the \$280,000,000 contract authorization, leaving the \$279,000,000 supplemental estimate to be considered later if and when authorized by Congress, and leaving further the \$1,047,715,600 civil functions and relief for occupied areas when that bill is considered, which it will be as soon as the present bill is disposed of.

THE PRESENT BILL WILL ONLY REPRESENT A PART OF THE TOTAL WAR DEPARTMENT CUT IN APPROPRIATIONS

The present bill will only represent a part of the total savings in War Department appropriations. Further savings will undoubtedly be made in rivers and harbors, flood control, Panama Canal, as well as other civil-function items which will come before this House later. Savings are also possible in the \$725,000,000 estimate for relief in occupied areas. It is only when these items have been considered and passed upon, that

total savings in the War Department appropriations will be determined.

SIXTY-ONE AND FIVE-TENTHS PERCENT OF ARMY BUDGET IS FOR PERSONNEL

In order to reduce a budget intelligently one should know what one is eliminating. A careful analysis of the Army budget shows that—

First. Three billion five hundred and twenty-three million five hundred and sixty-eight thousand two hundred and sixty-seven of the total appropriation of \$5,717,791,500 considered in this bill, or 61.5 percent is for Army personnel, civilian and military.

Second. Of this \$3,523,568,267 for total Army personnel, \$2,295,000,543 or 40 percent of the total budget is for military personnel and \$1,228,567,724, or 21.5 percent of the total budget is for civilian personnel.

Third. The remaining \$2,194,223,233 or 38.5 percent is for gas, oil, planes, maintenance, travel, rations, subsistence, equipment and other nonpersonnel items usually found in the budget.

PERSONNEL MUST BE CUT IF SUBSTANTIAL SAVINGS ARE TO BE MADE

It is obvious from the foregoing analysis that no substantial saving can be made without a cut in civilian and Army personnel, since they constitute 61.5 percent of that part of the War Department budget considered here. I shall first consider Army military personnel.

WE MUST HAVE AN EFFECTIVE ARMY OF 1,070,000 OFFICERS AND MEN

I have repeatedly stated that any action I took in cutting the War Department budget would be with a view of maintaining an effective army of the presently authorized 1,070,000 officers and men, including an effective Army Air Force of 400,000 officers and men and any cuts that I have advocated have been with that objective.

JUST WHAT KIND OF AN ARMY DID WE HAVE BEFORE AND DURING THE WAR AND WHAT WAS RELATIVE OFFICER STRENGTH?

Before we proceed further let us examine the Army record and see what the percentage of officer strength was before and during the war.

First. March 1940: In March 1940 the total military strength of the Army was 249,466 officers and men. We had 18,870 or 7.6 percent officers. Nurses were not then commissioned officers.

Second. September 1941: In September 1941 the total strength of the Army was 1,601,013, including 116,989 or 7.3 percent officers. Nurses were not commissioned officers.

Third. March 1945: In March 1945, at the height of hostilities, just before Germany surrendered, with thousands of officers engaged in the procurement and production of billions of dollars' worth of war supplies and equipment, with thousands more being trained and held to replace casualties on every front, we had a total Army strength of 8,167,387, including 869,094, or 10.7 percent, officers. Nurses were commissioned officers and are included.

Fourth. January 1947: In January 1947 the total strength of the Army was 1,253,619, including 151,914, or 12.1 percent, officers.

Fifth. The budget proposes an Army of 1,070,000 officers and men, with 146,000, or approximately 13.7 percent, officers, assuming they have the full number of enlisted men.

The Army is now asking nearly twice the percentage of officers it had in September 1941 and 3 percent more officers than it had in March 1945, at the height of hostilities. This in the face of the largest reservoir of wartime officers—480,000—in reserve we have ever had and in the face of thousands of National Guard officers and an extensive peacetime officer reserve training program.

**JUST WHAT KIND OF AN ARMY DID THE WAR DEPARTMENT ASK FOR?**

Just what kind of an Army did the War Department ask for when it appeared before the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives a year ago in March and April 1946? What was the testimony given by the War Department before that committee at that time upon which the legislation was based authorizing an Army of 1,070,000 officers and men? Let us examine the record.

**OFFICER STRENGTH**

A. On March 22, 1946, Maj. Gen. Willard G. Paul, General Staff, G-1, United States Army, testified before the Military Affairs Committee as follows:

We figure, roughly, 10 percent officer strength of the total strength. That means we would have around 140,000 to 150,000 officers on the 1st of July of this year (1946) and about 100,000 on the 1st of July next year

(1947). (See p. 55 of hearings before Military Affairs Committee.)

The tables inserted in the record later show that they expected to have 1,550,000 officers and men on July 1, 1946—see page 151 of same hearings.

B. A statement by Brig. Gen. Gordon E. Textor was submitted by the War Department for the record in the hearings before the Military Affairs Committee on April 4, 1946. On page 161 of these hearings General Textor said, in part:

Thus, on January 1, 1948, when requirements are estimated to be 1,070,000 officers and men, total personnel available would consist of 634,000 volunteer enlisted men, 100,000 officers, and 65,000 inductees still in service—or a total of 799,000. We would thus be short 270,000 men.

He was arguing for a compulsory selective-service law. It will be noted that both General Paul and General Textor included 13,500 warrant officers and nurses in the total of 100,000 officers required for an Army of 1,070,000 officers and men, since all of the remaining 970,000 men over and above the 100,000 officers were accounted for as either enlisted or drafted men or men short and to be acquired either by draft or enlistment.

C. On April 4, 1946, Brig. Gen. Gordon B. Textor inserted in the record of the hearings—page 162—above referred to two tables of requirements and availables of an Army of 1,070,000 officers and men as of July 1, 1946, July 1, 1947, and January 1, 1948, which reads as follows:

*Requirements and availables—24-month term of service for inductees*

Date	Volunteer Army (enlisted men)	All officers	Total officers and enlisted men	Inducted men in service	Total available	Requirements (officers and enlisted men)	Surplus or deficit
July 1, 1946.....	800,000	150,000	950,000	600,000	1,550,000	1,550,000	0
July 1, 1947.....	719,000	100,000	819,000	200,000	1,019,000	1,070,000	-51,000
Jan. 1, 1948.....	634,000	100,000	734,000	65,000	799,000	1,070,000	-271,000

NOTES.—No selective service after May 1946. 24-month term of service for inductees.

*Requirements and availables—18-month term of service for inductees*

Date	Volunteer Army (enlisted men)	All officers	Total officers and enlisted men	Inducted men in service	Total available	Requirements (officers and enlisted men)	Surplus or deficit
July 1, 1946.....	800,000	150,000	950,000	600,000	1,550,000	1,550,000	0
July 1, 1947.....	719,000	100,000	819,000	30,000	849,000	1,070,000	-221,000
Jan. 1, 1948.....	634,000	100,000	734,000	0	734,000	1,070,000	-336,000

NOTES.—No selective service after May 1946. 18-month term of service for inductees.

In each case officers were computed at 10 percent of the total strength of the Army. The fact that in each instance they used the word "all officers" in the tables and then accounted for the remainder of the Army over and above the number of officers as enlisted or drafted men seems to be conclusive evidence that the plans of the War Department at that time were on the basis of 10 percent officer strength. In view of the fact that we have a Reserve officer strength of 480,000 plus a great number of National Guard officers and in view of our Reserve officers' training program for younger officers it appears that a 10-percent officer strength for a Regular Army was sound and adequate for our national defense.

There is no doubt but what the Military Affairs Committee and the House of Representatives in authorizing an Army of 1,070,000 officers and men had in mind 10 percent or 100,000 officer strength, as no other figure was at any time even suggested by anyone either inside or outside the Army.

D. During the hearings on this bill I asked the Army for a table of organization for an Army of 1,070,000 officers and men based upon 100,000 officers or 10 percent officer strength. This table was never furnished the committee. The Army had apparently changed its mind. Now let us examine the record of the hearings on this bill and see what they asked for.

E. While in April 1946 they asked for 10 percent officer strength, the first evidence that the Army had changed its mind came when it announced its plans for a reduced strength from January 1, 1947, and July 1, 1947. The record of the hearings on this bill shows—page 40—that on December 31, 1946, the Army had 162,515 officers and 1,156,968 enlisted men or a total of 1,319,583 officers and men and planned to have on July 1, 1947, 923,848 enlisted men and 146,152 officers for a total of 1,070,000 officers and enlisted men. They proposed to reduce enlisted men 20 percent and officers 10 percent during the last 6 months prior to July 1, 1947, when the limit was placed at and reduced to 1,070,000 officers and men. They increased the officer strength from 10 percent to approximately 13.7 percent of the total strength by adding 46,000 more officers than they told the Military Affairs Committee they required, thereby increasing the officer strength and reducing the enlisted strength by the same number, 46,000.

**THIS CHANGE IN OFFICER STRENGTH COST THE TAXPAYERS \$253,000,000**

The average cost of an Army officer is approximately \$5,500 a year. On this basis these 46,000 officers cost the taxpayers \$253,000,000, or more than a quarter of a billion dollars. The present budget as submitted to the Congress includes this \$253,000,000. Some of the members of our subcommittee felt that the War Department had broken faith with the Military Affairs Committee and with the Congress. In view of the fact we had more than 480,000 wartime Reserve officers, in addition to National Guard officers and Reserve officers being trained, and in view of the further fact that most of these 46,000 officers would probably join the Officers' Reserve if dropped from the Regular rolls, some of the members of our subcommittee felt that the first War Department estimate was right and that 100,000 officers were adequate. These members felt that these 46,000 surplus officers could be dropped and the \$253,000,000 saved for the hard-pressed taxpayers of America without impairing our national defense.

**MAJORITY OF COMMITTEE DID NOT AGREE**

The majority of the committee did not agree on dropping these 46,000 officers and saving this \$253,000,000. We went into the question further, called Secretary of War Patterson, Major General Richards, Army budget officer, and Major General Paul and several other officers before our committee for further evidence.

**ARMY PROPOSED ONE OFFICER TO SIX OR SEVEN ENLISTED MEN FOR AIR CORPS AND ONE TO EIGHT OR NINE FOR OTHER THAN AIR**

A. Maj. Gen. George Richards, budget officer, testified before our committee, that the ratio of officers to enlisted men should be one officer to eight or nine enlisted men in other than air. This would mean one-seventh or one-eighth officer strength for the Air Corps and one-eighth to one-ninth for other than Air Corps strength—pages 42 and 43 of hearings. The testimony further shows that the Secretary of War ordered the Air Corps cut temporarily for the fiscal year 1948 from 401,000 officers and men



as proposed to the Military Affairs Committee to 375,000 officers and men. On this basis of one-eighth officer strength if we gave the War Department all it asked for, the Air Corps would be entitled to 47,000 officers or one-eighth of 375,000. The other than air forces would have 695,000 officers and men and would on the basis of one officer to nine enlisted men be entitled to one-tenth officers or 69,500 officers. This would give them a total of 116,500. This is upon the assumption that they would have 100 percent authorized enlisted strength.

B. If we adopt this plan we could cut off 29,500 officers which at \$5,500 each would be a saving of \$162,250,000 for the taxpayers. Some of the members of the committee felt that this saving could be made without impairing national defense.

C. If we gave the Army these 116,500 officers in addition to 13,500 warrant officers and nurses making a total officer strength of 130,000 we would cut off 16,000 officers which at \$5,500 each would be a savings of \$88,000,000.

D. General Eisenhower's evidence was about the same as that of General Richards, that is, 10 percent other than air and 15.6 percent or approximately 6.5 enlisted men to one officer for the Air Corps. General Richards was undoubtedly and naturally giving General Eisenhower's views.

#### SUMMARY ON OFFICER PROPOSALS

The committee considered carefully the following three proposals:

First. Whether to cut off 46,000 officers and save \$253,000,000 for the taxpayers, giving the Army the total officer strength of 100,000 requested when they appeared before the Military Affairs Committee when that committee and the House determined the strength of the Army on April 1, 1946.

Second. Fix the ratio of one officer to seven enlisted men for air and one officer to nine enlisted men for other than Air Force, or a total officer strength of 116,500. We could save on this basis \$162,250,000 for the taxpayers.

Third. Give the Army the ratio of 1 officer to 7 enlisted men for air and 1 officer to 9 enlisted men in other than air forces in addition to 13,500 warrant officers and nurse officers for a total officer strength of 130,000, cutting off 16,000 officers at \$5,500 per officer, or a total saving of \$88,000,000.

Fourth. Give the Army what it asked for—146,000 officers, despite all testimony, and let the taxpayer foot the bill and save nothing.

The committee finally decided on the following:

First. Cut off 2,600 warrant officers at a saving of \$10,000,000.

Second. Cut off 17,500 officers at \$5,500 each at a saving of \$96,250,000.

Third. Make no reduction in officer nurses, dietitians, and so forth.

Fourth. No reduction of enlisted personnel was considered at any time.

This made a total reduction of 20,500 officers and warrant officers at a saving of \$106,250,000.

The committee believed that many officers were placed on a flying status and were given flying pay who were not en-

titled to such pay. I asked the Air Corps to screen the list of flying officers carefully and take off such officers as were not entitled to flying pay. They took off 696 officers at a saving of \$1,100,000. The committee considered that entirely inadequate and reduced flying pay by \$3,600,000. In view of the fact that the total flying pay aggregates \$68,000,000, I still consider the reduction inadequate.

#### CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

In considering a reduction of civilian employees in the War Department one must first determine just how many civilian employees the Department planned on having during 1948 when the 1947—this year's—budget request was made and when an army of 1,070,000 officers and men was planned.

#### FIRST ASKED FOR 335,000 CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES IN THE ZONE OF INTERIOR OF UNITED STATES

In May 1946, when the hearings were held on the 1947 military appropriations bill for the War Department, Fletcher C. Waller, then Director of Civilian Personnel and Training, testified before our subcommittee as follows:

Mr. ENGEL. Can you give us the maximum and minimum or the number (of civilian employees) on July 1, 1947?

Mr. WALLER. It is anticipated that the number will be down to 335,000 on July 1, 1947.

Mr. ENGEL. How many of these will be in Washington?

Mr. WALLER. The average throughout the fiscal year will be about 21,000.

He later testified that on July 1, 1947, 19,000 civilian employees would be in Washington—see page 92 of hearings on 1947 military appropriations bill.

Again:

Mr. ENGEL. These civilian employees, of course, include employees in the armories, those engaged in war production, and so forth?

Mr. WALLER. Those are all employees with military functions; it does not include the civil functions of the War Department.

The above testimony referred, of course, to the number of civilian employees in the zone of interior of the United States.

#### TESTIMONY ON PRESENT BILL SHOWS 40 CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES FOR EVERY 100 SOLDIERS

Mr. A. H. Onthank, the present and also the prewar Director of Civilian Personnel, testified on February 17, 1947, before our subcommittee that the War Department required 35 to 40 civilians for every 100 soldiers. His specific testimony appears on page 156 of the hearings and is as follows:

Mr. ONTHANK. If you give the War Department a job to do which requires 1,000,000 soldiers it means roughly 35 to 40 percent civilians to back this up.

We have 500,000 officers and enlisted men in the zone of interior of the United States now and on the basis of 40 civilians for every 100 soldiers the War Department requirements would be met for the zone of interior by giving them 200,000 civilians.

Mr. Onthank testified further that there were 85,000 civilians in the zone of interior supporting overseas garrisons—see pages 133 and 134 of War Department hearings.

On this basis the total requirement for War Department civilian personnel in the zone of interior of the United States is 285,000.

#### HOW MANY CIVILIANS DOES THE WAR DEPARTMENT NOW WANT IN ZONE OF INTERIOR?

Brig. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Acting Deputy Director of Personnel, testified before our subcommittee that they required 365,000 civilian employees not including 30,000 employees engaged in various types of production in our arsenals and elsewhere. This would place the total requirement for the zone of interior of the United States at 395,000 or 60,000 more than Mr. Waller testified they needed on July 1, 1947, and 75,000 more than Mr. Onthank testified they required.

#### THE 1948 BUDGET PROVIDES MONEY FOR 414,613 CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES FOR ZONE OF INTERIOR

Your committee went over the budget carefully, analyzed and computed the number of civilian employees provided for in the budget for each department or branch of service, as shown in six tables inserted. These tables will be referred to again. They show the following:

Table I: That the budget provided for 344,644 civilian employees in military establishments in the zone of interior of the United States. This table, of course, does not include the employees in tables II, III, and IV. Neither does it include overseas employees in No. V. Neither does it include the 30,000 civilian employees engaged in industrial production in our arsenals, quartermaster depots, and elsewhere. The budget has \$868,240,343 to pay these 344,644 employees.

Table II: That the budget provided \$52,498,690 to pay 16,583 departmental civilian employees.

Table III: That the budget provided \$16,431,655 to pay 5,186 employees engaged or who will be engaged in industrial mobilization and planning.

Table IV: That the budget provided \$59,426,290 to pay 18,201 civilian employees engaged in research and development. These are in addition to some who will be paid out of industrial production funds.

The above four tables do not include 30,000 employees engaged in industrial production of war supplies and equipment within the zone of interior. The total civilian employees in the zone of interior of the United States, including the 30,000 industrial employees provided for in the budget, are 414,613.

Table V: This table shows that the budget provided for 110,420 civilian employees of the War Department employed overseas in our possessions and occupied areas who will be paid \$215,050,527.

Table VI: This is a summary of all civilian employees both overseas and in the zone of interior, but does not include the 30,000 industrial production employees. When we add these 30,000 we find that the budget provides for an over-all total of 525,034 civilian employees for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948. Of these employees, 495,034 will be paid a total of \$1,212,087,505. The other 30,000 will be paid out of production money. As was stated, industrial employees are paid out of production funds. For example, the

ordnance may have a certain amount of money to purchase Garand rifles or some other item. It may let a contract to a private corporation for a part of this amount and another contract to Springfield Armory, owned and operated by the Army Ordnance. The employees engaged in the production of this item at the Armory or Arsenal are paid out of the contract price, the Armory or Arsenal being in the same position as a private contractor. The amount paid these employees is not included in "Pay of the Army," but in the amount allowed for the production and purchase of supplies and equipment. The same is true with regard to the production of clothing by the Quartermaster General at the Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot and other similar production items.

THE BILL BEFORE THE HOUSE PROVIDES FOR A REDUCTION OF 74,648 CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES AND A SAVING OF \$184,086,212

The tables above referred to and inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks show that if the bill is passed in its present form, it will provide for a reduction of 74,631 civilian employees at a saving of \$184,086,216. The purpose of itemizing the proposed savings in personnel was not to tie down the War Department to exactly the number of employees named for each service but to give the committee's idea as to where cuts might and should be made.

COMMITTEE OPPOSED TO REDUCING CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES ENGAGED IN RESEARCH AND INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION

The committee, however, had a firm conviction and was strongly opposed to cutting any civilian personnel engaged in research and development.

#### TABLES CAREFULLY WORKED OUT

These reduction tables were very carefully worked out. Each item was considered carefully and separately before the reduction was decided upon. The savings were made with the record of present and past War Department hearings in mind. It will be noted that reductions in personnel range from no reduction up to 25 percent. The over-all reduction averages approximately 15 percent both in number of employees and in the total dollar reduction. It was the intention of the committee that the percentage of reduction should be as uniform as possible in employees of all grades, unless it appeared that a service was top-heavy on higher grade employees.

#### ZONE OF INTERIOR REDUCTION

The total reduction of employees recommended in the zone of interior is 63,590 out of a total of 414,614 employees, including the 30,000 industrial employees.

A. This leaves a total for the zone of interior of 351,024 employees, or 16,024 more than Mr. Waller testified the Army planned to carry over on July 1, 1947, and 66,024 more than Mr. Onthank's testimony showed the Army required.

B. If we take the entire number of 74,631 out of the 414,613 employees in the zone of interior, including the 11,041 reduced in overseas personnel, then the Army would still have 339,983 employees in the zone of interior, or 4,983 more than Mr. Waller said they expected to have on July 1, 1947, and 54,983 more than Mr. Onthank thought they required.

C. In view of the constant reports which came to the committee from various sources of the large number of civilian employees in the armies of occupation and in our overseas theaters, including our island possessions, the committee felt that a 10-percent cut could be made in those theaters without hampering operations or national defense, and the committee so recommends. This 10-percent cut in overseas personnel would, of course, be a part of the total reduction made herein. The total figures are shown in table VI inserted at the conclusion of my remarks.

#### SUMMARY OF CUTS IN ARMY AND CIVILIAN PERSONNEL AND PAY

Reduction of 17,500 officers at a saving of \$96,250,000.

Reduction of 2,600 warrant officers, \$10,000,000.

Reduction in flying pay, \$3,600,000.

Reduction of 74,631 civilian employees, as per tables attached, \$184,086,216.

Savings on personnel by the total reduction of 20,100 officers and 74,631 civilians, \$293,916,216.

#### GENERAL REMARKS ON REDUCTION OF ITEMS OF EQUIPMENT, SUPPLIES, ETC.

In considering a reduction of any appropriation for clothing, supplies, matériel, equipment, weapons, and other items, one must take into consideration the following facts:

A. What was the inventory on hand in terms of dollars and, whenever practical, in terms of weapons or items requested?

B. The amount available for expenditure from prior years' appropriations and the unliquidated obligations, and whether those unliquidated obligations were in part for obligations represented by unpaid invoices of goods carried in the inventory.

C. The amount of the appropriation for the preceding year, 1947 in this case, and the amount expended to the latest date.

D. The amount of the appropriation asked for in the current 1948 budget, including contract authorization.

E. The total amount available for expenditure if the amount requested is appropriated.

I. ARMY AIR FORCES 56 PERCENT OF TOTAL MILITARY BUDGET; TOTAL MILITARY BUDGET SUBMITTED IS \$5,997,791,000

The total military budget of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, is \$5,717,791,000. This does not include the \$279,000,000 supplemental appropriation not yet submitted. Neither does it include the \$280,000,000 contract authorization given the Air Corps for planes, and so forth, which has been submitted. If we add this last amount to the \$5,717,791,000 submitted it gives us a total of \$5,997,791,000 for the Army which is here being considered.

#### II. ARMY AIR CORPS 1948 BUDGET REQUESTS

A. The total requests or cost of the Army Air Forces if all requests are granted for 1948 will aggregate \$3,372,330,000, or 56 percent of the total War Department military budget of \$5,997,791,000 submitted. Other than Air Forces will receive the remaining 44 percent, or \$2,625,461,000.

B. Of this \$3,372,330,000 for the Army Air Forces for 1948, should all amounts

be available, only (a) \$1,130,000,000, or one-third of this total, is appropriated directly to the Army Air Corps. This is for pay of civilians, planes, equipment, and so forth. Of the remaining sum, (b) \$1,351,000,000 will be appropriated to the pay of the Army for pay, including \$68,000,000 flying pay, subsistence, rent, and other allowances coming under this head; (c) \$346,000,000 will be appropriated to the Quartermaster Corps for clothing, rations, and other similar items; (d) for engineers service to Air Corps, \$169,000,000; transportation for Air Corps, \$135,000,000; services, equipment, and miscellaneous items furnished by other services, \$241,330,000.

#### III. HOW MUCH WILL THE ARMY AIR CORPS HAVE AVAILABLE FOR PLANES IF AMOUNT IS ALLOWED AND WHAT KIND OF AN AIR FORCE WILL WE HAVE?

Before we can determine what kind of an Air Force we will have, we must determine, first, the inventory value of usable planes and equipment on hand; second, the amount available and obligated for prior years for planes and equipment not yet delivered; third, the 1947 and 1948 appropriations.

#### INVENTORY OF AIRPLANES, SPARE PARTS, ENGINES, ETC.

Inventory: The dollar value of the items on hand on January 31, 1947, is as follows:

Thirty thousand five hundred and sixty-six complete aircraft usable for next 5 years, \$4,675,000,000.

Spare engines: Domestic, 52,187, \$773,000,000; overseas, 8,163, \$114,000,000.

Aircraft parts and accessories, \$1,158,000,000.

Equipment, \$462,000,000.

Total inventory on hand, \$7,182,000,000.

#### AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR EXPENDITURES FOR AIRPLANES, SPARE ENGINES AND PARTS, EQUIPMENT AFTER JANUARY 1, 1947

The amount available for expenditure for airplanes after January 1, 1947, spare engines, parts, equipment is as follows:

A. Out of 1945 and prior years' funds:

1. For 733 planes, \$257,603,559.

2. For spare engines and spare parts, \$94,354,488.

3. For Government-furnished equipment, \$90,607,460.

Total available from 1945 and prior-year funds, \$342,565,507.

B. Out of 1946 year's funds:

1. For 635 airplanes, \$139,485,547.

2. For spare engines, \$35,805,056.

3. For Government-furnished equipment and maintenance, spare parts, \$85,159,805.

4. Radar and radio equipment, \$23,003,613.

5. Training equipment, \$5,142,645.

Total available for expenditure from 1946 funds, \$288,596,666.

C. Out of 1947 funds: The total appropriation for planes, spare parts, allowed by Congress for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, was \$401,870,900. In September 1946 the President through his Budget Director impounded \$30,000,000 of this amount and in April 1947 sent a message to Congress asking that \$135,000,000 Air Corps money, including this \$30,000,000 be transferred from the Air Corps to pay of the Army and it was so transferred. This left a balance of \$371,870,900 available for expenditure for this



purpose. Congress further appropriated \$52,781,800 for radar and radio equipment bringing the total available for these two purposes to \$424,652,700, \$8,246,037 of which has been expended for these purposes up to January 1, 1947, leaving a balance available for expenditure of \$416,406,663 from 1947 funds. This will allow the production of 681 planes at present prices in addition to spare engines, spare parts, and so forth.

D. Out of 1948 funds if allowed: The total appropriation and contract authorization for planes, spare parts, and engines requested for 1948 is as follows: Appropriation requested for 838 planes at present prices, \$400,000,000.

For spare engines and parts, \$40,000,000.

For radio and radar, \$40,000,000.

Total 1948 appropriation requested for planes, spare parts, spare engines, radar and radio, \$480,000,000.

#### SUMMARY

##### Inventory on hand:

Thirty thousand five hundred and sixty-six complete aircraft, latest used in war and usable for average of 5 years, \$4,675,000,000.

Sixty thousand three hundred and fifty spare engines, \$887,000,000.

Aircraft parts, accessories, and equipment, \$1,620,000,000.

Total inventory on hand, \$7,182,000,000.

#### AVAILABLE FOR EXPENDITURE AFTER JANUARY 1, 1947, FOR PLANES AND EQUIPMENT

From 1945 and prior years appropriation, including 733 planes, \$342,565,507.

From 1946 funds including 635 planes, \$288,596,666.

Balance 1947 appropriation including 681 planes, \$416,406,663.

From 1948 appropriation including 838 planes, radio and radar, \$480,000,000.

Total available after January 1, 1947, for planes, spare parts, engines, equipment, including radio and radar, \$1,527,568,836.

Inventory of planes, engines, and spare parts, \$7,182,000,000.

Total inventory and expenditure available if all requests are granted, \$8,709,568,836.

#### DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF PLANES, ETC.

The committee considered and reconsidered the question of whether or not a reduction in the appropriation for planes, spare parts, and engines could be made. Our decision was made more difficult by the fact that the President had reduced our 1947 appropriation for planes from \$401,870,900 to \$371,870,900 and at the same time had asked Congress to appropriate \$480,000,000 more for planes, spare engines or spare parts, radio and radar equipment.

#### DECISION OF COMMITTEE

The decision was finally made that a reduction of 10 percent of the \$440,000,000 appropriation for planes, spare engines, and so forth, could and should be made. This will reduce this appropriation by \$44,000,000 or to \$396,000,000. It will give the Army Air Corps \$25,000,000 more cash appropriation for 1948 for this purpose than the President left them in 1947 after transferring \$30,000,000 plane money to the pay-of-the-Army fund.

The Army Air Corps will have available for expenditure after January 1, 1947, for planes, spare parts, engines, equipment, including radio and radar, the sum of \$1,483,558,836.

#### AIR FORCE EQUIPMENT IF PROGRAM IS CARRIED OUT

If this program is carried out our inventory of airplanes, spare engines, and other usable equipment will be as follows:

First. Inventory of 30,566 complete usable aircraft, 60,350 spare engines, spare parts, radio, radar, and other equipment as of January 1, 1947, \$7,182,000,000.

Second. Value and cost of 2,683 of the latest planes of every type to be paid out of 1945, 1946, 1947, and 1948 money. This includes a large number of heavy bombers, transport and fast fighter planes, also including adequate spare engines, parts, radio, radar, and other equipment, \$1,483,558,836.

Total inventory of planes and equipment if and when this program is carried out will be \$8,665,558,836.

We would, of course, have to deduct from this sum the number of planes that would be lost, damaged beyond repair, or destroyed after January 1, 1947.

#### MUST NOT BE OVEROPTIMISTIC

It must be noted that while the picture looks good now and perhaps for a year or two more, it will become increasingly worse because of the large number of planes which will become obsolete during the next 1 to 5 years. It is hoped that the plane production program can and will be increased materially as and in proportion to the reduction of Federal expenses. We hope for a reduction in expenditures in United States aid to foreign countries as well as a reduction of occupational and other costs as peace treaties are made. My purpose in giving the present-day picture is not to be misconstrued. This picture does not warrant the note of pessimism that has been current in the Nation regarding our relative air strength on the one hand. Neither does it warrant a note of overoptimism. In fact the real danger to our national defense lies in a possible overoptimism as to our military and of course our air strength.

#### RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FOR AIR

The amount available for expenditure for research and development for the Air Corps from 1948 and prior years' appropriations if the total 1948 requests are granted are as follows:

From 1945 and prior years appropriations, \$105,597,949.

From 1946 appropriation, \$206,576,849.

From 1947 appropriation: The Congress appropriated \$185,000,000 for research and development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947. In September 1946 the President impounded \$75,000,000 of this amount and in April 1947 sent a message to Congress asking that this sum be transferred to "Pay of the Army." In view of the fact that it was then too late to obligate this sum efficiently according to the testimony, the committee granted the request for the transfer leaving the net sum of \$110,000,000 available for that purpose. Fourteen million one hundred and thirty thousand four hundred and seventeen dollars had been expended prior to January 1, 1947, leaving

as available for expenditure after that date the sum of \$95,869,583.

From 1948 appropriation, \$145,000,000.

The committee made no reduction in this appropriation.

#### TOTAL AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR RESEARCH AFTER JANUARY 1, 1947

The total amount available for research and development after January 1, 1947, out of 1945, 1946, 1947, and 1948 appropriations, if this bill is passed in its present form, will be \$553,044,391.

In concluding my remarks on this part of the bill I want to point out the irregularity of the past program on research and development. In order to obtain the maximum results with the minimum expenditure a research program must be planned over a term of years and the money, whatever the amount determined upon, must flow evenly and with the long-term program in mind constantly. The system of appropriating money, planning, then reducing the appropriation made and appropriating a larger sum again will bring a minimum result with a maximum expenditure instead of a maximum result with a minimum expenditure.

#### TRANSPORTATION CORPS

The budget estimate for the Transportation Corps aggregated \$400,000,000, or 7 percent of the entire military budget of \$5,717,000,000. This does not include the cost of the Air Transport Command. If we were to include this item it would run close to 10 percent. This in the opinion of the committee is entirely too high. This service had \$374,062,232 unexpended balance of 1946 and prior years funds, including according to figures furnished me \$101,320,203 overseas funds called triple-O funds and \$137,529,935 unallotted funds. The budget provides for a total pay roll of \$127,355,442 to pay 54,622 civilian employees. The committee after careful consideration recommends a reduction of \$52,422,773 below the budget estimate. This includes a reduction of 9,139 civilian employees and a \$22,422,773 reduction in the transportation pay roll, or a nonpersonnel reduction of \$30,000,000.

#### AIR CORPS SUPPLIES, ETC.

In addition to the reduction in personnel and the 10-percent reduction on airplanes, spare engines, and parts which has been fully discussed, the following reductions were made:

Supplies and equipment, \$300,000.

Transportation, \$6,143,075.

Fuel and oil, \$10,041,444.

Procurement of air-borne and ground communications equipment, \$9,479,026.

Miscellaneous, \$971,000.

Total, Air Corps, not including personnel and airplanes, \$26,934,525.

#### ENGINEER CORPS

The budget estimate of the Engineer Corps was \$365,000,000. The committee allowed \$299,214,506, with a reduction of \$65,785,494, including \$32,204,640 reduction in personnel pay roll. The remainder of \$33,580,854 was a reduction in matériel, supplies, and equipment, including \$20,000,000 reduction in barracks and quarters. As high as 14.75 percent administrative overhead charge was added

to some of these items. A total of \$14,798,278 was so added, which the committee thought excessive.

OTHER REDUCTIONS IN SUPPLIES, EQUIPMENT, ETC.

A reduction of \$16,303,401, in addition to personnel reduction, was made in the

Quartermaster appropriation request for clothing and other items. No reductions were made in the Medical Corps outside of a 10-percent cut in personnel. A non-personnel reduction of \$5,360,905 was made in the Signal Corps. A nonpersonnel reduction of \$8,525,510 was made

in the Ordnance Department. The remaining \$17,167,666 nonpersonnel reduction which makes up the total reduction of \$475,809,077, was made in other services not mentioned in this paragraph. All items including the above are included in the committee report.

TABLE I.—Civilian employees, Military Establishment appropriation, 1948, zone of the interior only

Appropriation title	Number	Reduction		Budget estimate	Reduction in dollars
		Percent	Number		
National War College.....	101			\$292,500	
Command and Staff College.....	153			370,500	
Finance Department:					
Pay of the Army.....	18,774	20	3,755	45,795,854	\$9,159,171
Finance Service.....	9,375	20	1,875	23,467,186	4,693,437
Quartermaster Corps:					
Welfare of enlisted men.....	700	20	140	1,942,907	388,581
Clothing and equipage.....	13,284	20	2,657	27,056,561	5,411,312
Incidental expenses.....	27,337	25	6,834	65,352,390	16,338,097
Transportation Service.....	135,007	20	27,001	94,150,283	18,830,057
Signal Corps.....	110,346	15	1,552	27,952,924	4,192,937
Air Corps.....	198,380	15	14,757	257,101,350	38,565,202
Medical and Hospital Department.....	119,567	10	1,957	49,505,424	4,950,542
Engineer Corps:					
Engineer Service.....	5,120	20	1,024	14,475,200	2,895,040
Barracks and quarters.....	47,994	20	9,599	121,489,498	24,297,899
Ordnance Department:					
Ordnance Service.....	50,370	15	7,555	116,829,394	17,524,409
Rock Island Bridge.....	13			36,143	
Chemical Corps.....	2,050	20	410	5,196,696	1,039,359
Army Ground Forces, training and operation.....	1,337			3,668,070	
U. S. Military Academy, maintenance.....	1,256			3,252,543	162,627
Organized Reserves.....	3,455		345	10,241,840	1,024,184
National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice.....	25			63,080	
Total, military activities.....	344,644		59,524	868,240,343	149,472,934

<sup>1</sup> Does not include "Research and development" personnel.

<sup>2</sup> Does not include either "Research and development" or "Industrial mobilization" personnel.

TABLE II.—Civilian employees, Military Establishment appropriation, 1948, departmental employees only

Appropriation title	Number	Reduction		Budget estimate	Reduction in dollars
		Percent	Number		
Office, Secretary of War.....	1,097	25	274	\$3,475,000	\$868,750
Office, Chief of Staff.....	2,264	25	566	8,550,000	2,137,500
Adjutant General's Office.....	4,300	20	860	11,088,000	2,217,600
Office, Inspector General.....	74	20	15	181,000	36,200
Office, Judge Advocate General.....	160			506,000	
Office, Chief of Finance.....	565	20	113	1,685,000	337,000
Office, Quartermaster General.....	1,805	20	361	5,462,000	1,092,400
Office, Chief of Transportation.....	820	26	164	2,767,000	553,400
Office, Chief Signal Officer.....	625	20	125	2,091,000	418,200
Office, Commanding General, Army Air Forces.....	1,705	25	426	5,250,300	1,312,575
Office, Surgeon General.....	695	10	69	2,229,350	222,939
Office, Chief of Engineers.....	1,079	25	270	4,252,000	1,063,000
Office, Chief of Ordnance.....	1,040	25	260	3,763,000	940,750
Office, Chief of Chemical Corps.....	129	25	32	525,000	131,250
Office, Chief of Chaplains.....	35			95,000	
National Guard Bureau.....	125			351,000	
Provost Marshal General's Office.....	50	20	10	176,000	35,200
Special Service Division.....	15	20	3	52,000	10,400
Total, departmental.....	16,583		3,548	52,408,690	11,377,164

TABLE III.—Civilian employees, Military Establishment appropriation, 1948, industrial mobilization

Appropriation title	Number	Reduction		Budget estimate	Reduction in dollars
		Percent	Number		
Quartermaster Corps, regular supplies.....	131	10	13	\$440,000	\$44,000
Signal Service.....	42	10	4	165,947	16,595
Engineer Service.....	43	10	4	140,000	14,000
Ordnance Service and supplies.....	3,953	10	395	12,955,000	1,295,500
Chemical Corps.....	1,017	10	102	2,730,708	273,071
Total, industrial mobilization.....	5,186		518	16,431,655	1,643,166

NOTE.—In addition to the above reductions in cost of personnel there is a reduction of \$1,002,334 in industrial mobilization funds other than personnel.

TABLE IV.—Civilian employees, Military Establishment appropriation, 1948, research and development

Appropriation title	Number	Reduction		Budget estimate	Reduction in dollars
		Percent	Number		
Transportation Service.....	103			\$410,000	
Signal Corps.....	2,678			10,048,080	
Air Corps.....	7,970			25,316,400	
Medical and Hospital Department.....	258			1,011,810	
Engineer Service.....	860			2,400,000	
Ordnance Service.....	5,089			15,800,000	
Chemical Corps.....	1,243			4,440,000	
Total, research and development.....	18,201			59,426,290	

NOTE.—The total estimate for research and development, including the personnel costs shown above, is \$222,216,400.



TABLE V.—Civilian employees, Military Establishment appropriation, 1948, overseas only

Appropriation title	Number	Reduction		Budget estimate	Reduction in dollars
		Percent	Number		
Finance service:					
Pay of the Army	15,242	10	1,524	\$33,900,000	\$3,390,000
Finance Service	562	10	56	1,459,132	145,913
Quartermaster Corps:					
Welfare of enlisted men	840	10	84	2,334,785	233,478
Clothing and equipage	4,144	10	414	4,963,517	496,352
Incidental expenses of the Army	11,110	10	1,111	18,075,843	1,807,584
Transportation Service	18,600	10	1,860	30,028,159	3,002,816
Signal Service	3,721	10	372	7,729,680	772,968
Air Corps	23,900	10	2,390	53,471,700	5,347,170
Medical and Hospital Department	3,171	10	317	6,732,521	673,252
Engineer Service	15,910	10	1,591	39,137,108	3,913,711
Ordnance Service and supplies	13,038	10	1,304	17,015,200	1,701,520
Chemical Corps	92	10	9	202,882	20,288
Total, overseas	110,420		11,041	215,050,527	21,505,052

TABLE VI.—Total reduction of all employees appropriated for in the bill

Appropriation title	Number	Reduction		Budget estimate	Reduction in dollars
		Percent	Number		
Zone of the interior	244,644		59,524	\$868,680,343	\$149,560,834
Departmental	10,583		3,548	52,498,690	11,377,164
Industrial mobilization	5,186		518	16,431,655	1,643,166
Research and development	18,201			50,426,260	
Overseas	110,420		11,041	215,050,527	21,505,052
Total	495,034		74,631	1,212,087,505	184,086,216

Number of employees as shown above provided for in bill (495,034—74,631), 420,403. Funds appropriated for employees as shown above (\$1,212,087,505—\$184,086,216), \$1,028,001,289.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has consumed 50 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman referred to getting behind the iron curtain. Can the gentleman tell us how many Russian agents are in the United States getting in behind our curtain so as to find out what we are producing?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I do not know anything about that; I am not a sleuth.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I have only about 5 minutes remaining and I do not want to go over the hour unless, of course, the membership wishes to grant me more than an hour.

I would like to know; the United States Army, I am sure, would like to know, how they get military information out of Russia.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to ask the chairman this question: The Air Corps Material Division has indicated it would like to maintain 10 depots throughout continental United States. I understand there is organic law that creates arbitrarily only seven depots. Are there sufficient funds in the present bill for the Material Division of the Air Corps to operate 10 depots if it so desires?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. No. We gave them the money the Budget asked for, the amount the Budget asked for for those depots.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Am I to interpret the chairman's answer that that would be only seven depots?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Seven depots; yes.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. In reference to the gentleman's statement regarding the difficulties of knowing the number of airplanes Russia has, it is very easy to figure that out. We can figure out what we gave them and that is what they have.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The reports I get state that they are outproducing us. It was not the planes we gave them. We know what we gave them, so we are not worried about that. The story was as to the number of planes they are producing. Press reports stated that Russia was producing more planes than we were producing and that they were producing better planes.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that 90 percent of the taxpayers of this Nation demand that governmental expenses be cut. There are some expenses which have priority over others, and these taxpayers themselves realize this. The responsibility of being the wealthiest nation on the earth, and one which in normal times did one-half of the business of the world, places obligations on us, both morally and politically, which we must meet. Cutting our expenses and meeting our obligations is the most serious duty that ever confronted us.

We pyramided a debt of \$400,000,000,000 in World War II, and since the war we have given or loaned to our allies and

enemies of this war about \$22,000,000,000, and have made private investments in these countries of approximately \$14,500,000,000.

It is obvious that demands will be made upon this Nation to stabilize the affairs of the world for years to come, and it will require patience, knowledge, and wisdom to bring back a normal world. We doubtless have the patience and we have the physical attainment and knowledge which surpasses all other ages, but it is quite evident that what mankind lacks is wisdom. Knowledge is information gathered; wisdom is knowledge applied; and nations are like men—they know enough to do right, but, lacking wisdom, they do wrong. The trouble with the United Nations organization to promote peace upon the earth is that selfishness abounds and wisdom is lacking.

It is estimated that 19,000,000 men are today under arms and that 40 nations are spending at least \$27,000,000,000 on armaments, and the smoke of war still smothers some portions of the world. More than 16,000,000 of the total men in uniform constitute the ground armies, 6,000,000 of whom are in China, 4,000,000 in Russia, a million and two hundred and fifty thousand in Great Britain, and in the United States more than 670,000. This Nation has incomparably the greatest sea power, the tonnage and striking power of our Navy outranking all others in the world combined.

Crushing taxation burdens all the world, and outside the United States peacetime conscription is well-nigh universal, and more money is being spent today on indirect military objectives in the development of atomic force, bacteriological warfare, guided missiles, jet planes, and new weapons than was ever spent before in the history of the world.

The chairman of our subcommittee has informed you that the subcommittee charged with the responsibility to hear and determine the justifications for appropriations for the Military Establishments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, has spent many days in hearing testimony in support of the justifications and has discharged its responsibility to the best of its ability in appraising the needs of our Army and has reported its findings and recommendations to the full Committee on Appropriations, and now submits the approval of these findings to the House of Representatives for further determination.

Last year, when I as chairman of the Military Establishments Appropriations Subcommittee reported this annual bill, I was moved to mention the splendid cooperation on the part of every member of the subcommittee in our endeavor to bring to the House a bill that was adequate to meet the needs of a peacetime Army. With one exception, every member of the present subcommittee is the same as last year's subcommittee, and without exception, each member has discharged his responsibility with the same degree of care and patriotism that moved us in the performance of our prior duties.

The course of political events has relieved me of the responsibilities placed upon the chairman of the subcommittee and these responsibilities now rest upon the shoulders of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL]. Mr. ENGEL is one of the most industrious men in Congress. In the performance of the duties placed upon him by reason of his position as chairman of the subcommittee, he has spent many long and tedious hours in performing the duties incident to preparing a bill of the magnitude of the one now before us. He cannot be commended too highly for the physical and mental energy and the conscientious service he has put into this bill. His work has inspired each member of this committee, and, in my opinion, this Congress and this Nation owes him a debt of deepest gratitude.

Hearings on the bill now before the House were quite extensive and in view of the heavy duties imposed upon each individual member by other activities, and especially in the heavy work in our offices, the constant attendance of each member reflected his patriotic desire to perform a task of the highest importance. There are items in this bill which do not have the full endorsement of each member, but the conclusions arrived at represent the cooperative and combined judgment of the membership of this entire subcommittee.

The present world situation is such that an appropriation for national defense must be viewed in the light of international relations. There is at the present moment no firm basis for peace. I am convinced that our Nation is making every effort to secure an honorable, valid, and lasting peace, and it is now apparent that even if such a desired achievement will be accomplished, it does not appear to be possible in the near future. Of course, when these accomplishments are brought about and the world becomes friendly and stable

again, it will relieve this Nation from the necessity of maintaining a great standing army and providing funds to support it.

You will note that the largest single reduction made in the budget estimate is in the cost of the civilian personnel of the Army. This budget estimate approximated \$1,200,000,000. The committee, after thorough consideration, has recommended a reduction of \$184,086,216 in the budget estimate and the distribution of this reduction is shown in the tables in the report.

In the consideration of the estimates the committee developed the facts that just prior to Pearl Harbor, with an Army of 1,700,000, the supporting services of 380,000 civilian employees were utilized. At the peak of the wartime production, with an Army of 7,000,000 men and officers, there were 1,349,000 civilian employees; as of December 1946, the middle of the present fiscal year, with an Army of 1,319,000 men, there were employed in this country 411,000 civilians and in overseas areas 141,000, at an estimated cost of \$1,000,337,000. For the fiscal year 1948, the budget estimate called for 384,614 civilian employees in the zone of the interior plus 30,000 to be employed on approved projects and paid from funds made available on a project basis, and 110,420 for overseas services, totaling 525,034. And from this total number the committee recommends a reduction of 74,631, of which 63,590 are in the zone of the interior and 11,041 overseas. No reduction whatever was made in the civilian employee estimate for research and development, and no reduction is proposed in the 30,000 to be employed on approved projects. After careful consideration, it is the opinion of the subcommittee that a reduction of \$184,086,216 from this large item will in no way impair the program of our military service.

The next largest reduction made in the recommendation of the budget is in the appropriation entitled "Pay of the Army," and is brought about by a recommended substantial reduction in the number of officers and warrant officers. The justification for this is clearly supported by the fact that the Army has been reduced to 1,070,000 men, with a total of 132,500 officers and 13,500 warrant officers, nurses, dietitians, and physiotherapists. It was the opinion of the committee that this number of officers was excessive, and the committee suggests that one officer for each nine enlisted men is a proper proportion, and experience has indicated this rule to be correct. With the advance of science and technical equipment used by present-day armed forces, it is conceivable that a slightly higher percentage of officers might be required and might be desirable. With this thought in mind, a majority of the committee recommended that a reduction of 17,500 officers and 2,600 warrant officers be made, and in its recommendation has reduced this appropriation, on account of the reduction of officers, \$96,250,000, and, on account of the reduction of warrant officers, \$10,000,000. You will note that on a percentage basis this will provide for an Army of 1,070,000 men, supported by approxi-

mately 30 percent of that number of civilian personnel, and 12 percent office personnel, not including warrant officers.

#### QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Further suggested reductions are made by the committee in the Quartermaster Corps under the appropriation title "Regular Supplies of the Army." The budget request for \$82,000,000 has been reduced to a recommended amount of \$70,059,860—a reduction of \$11,940,140—and the reduction, as shown in the report, is distributed throughout the quartermaster items. The committee was informed that the four items bearing the greater portion of the recommended reductions have in their depots supplies in excess of \$53,000,000. I have no doubt that additional supplies are required in these items to supply the needs for the next fiscal year, but by proper management the supplies now on hand will be used first, insofar as possible, and with the additional funds provided in this bill the additional items required for the next year can be acquired.

I was impressed with the efficiency of the officers presenting the budget requirements for the Quartermaster Corps and believe in their ability to adjust their needs to the action taken by the committee. They are keenly aware of the requirements to keep members of the armed forces in good health, well-being, and high morale.

#### TRANSPORTATION CORPS

The Transportation Corps is primarily a service organization and its functions are to provide for the movement of Army personnel, supplies, equipment, and material. It has performed such duties in an admirable manner. It is not a policy-making organization and for that reason does not exercise control over the size, location, deployment, movement, or mission of the Army.

During recent years it is the general opinion that Army movements have been excessive; personnel has been moved many more times than would appear to be necessary, and each movement of personnel has required a corresponding movement of supplies, equipment, and material. This presents a difficult problem since the Transportation Corps is not directly responsible for the orders directing movement of troops, and so forth, but must provide the instrumentalities for the movement from funds appropriated to it. On the other hand, the administrative function responsible for the orders requiring transportation does not have the cost of that transportation taken from its appropriation. Therefore when the committee concludes that excessive funds are being spent for transportation it is not necessarily a reflection upon the Transportation Corps, but upon some other branch of the Department responsible for the orders requiring transportation. However, the only way an appropriating committee can attempt to remedy the situation is by reducing the funds requested for transportation and point out that the agencies of the Department responsible for directing excessive transportation should reconsider and be more conservative in requirements. On this basis, the budget request for the



Transportation Corps of \$400,000,000 has been reduced by \$30,000,000 in addition to the proposed reduction of \$21,832,873 in the civilian personnel items, \$553,400 in departmental personnel, and \$36,500 in industrial mobilization, leaving a total recommended appropriation for the Transportation Service of \$347,577,227.

#### RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The importance of scientific development cannot be overemphasized. Events which hastened the end of World War II make this crystal clear. Not only in the field of atomic energy is scientific development most important. On VJ-day our Nation excelled in this particular field; but in other scientific fields such as guided missiles, jet and rocket propulsion, and electronics, we now know that, in certain phases at least, we were not in the forefront. It is known, however, that in all these scientific fields only the surface has been scratched and that further utilization of benefits depends upon further research, discoveries, and developments.

The objective of all War Department research and development will be to apply the results of scientific analysis and research to the development of the most advanced weapons, techniques, material, and counter measures for the use of the Army in the execution of the military policy of the United States. This objective must envision the economic, political, industrial, and sociological implications with respect to the production of these weapons.

To implement such a broad objective, definite missions of research and development were presented to the committee as necessary. In brief, they are:

First. To create weapons which will be ahead of those of our competitors both in time and design.

Second. To create counter measures to the weapons of our competitors.

Third. To minimize the effect of climatic extremes on both men and weapons.

Fourth. To obtain the new scientific facts necessary to accomplish the foregoing objectives.

During the war, research facilities and programs were developed with haste to make up for our deficiencies. The accomplishments were without parallel in human history, but at the same time they were achieved at too great an expense both in time, money, and materials. If we profit from this expensive experience, we will develop a well-rounded program to explore all reasonable avenues of research and development; one which will insure our troops the most efficient, the lightest, the most durable, and the most climatic-resisting equipment possible to produce. The weapons will be the most accurate and the most mobile in the world. Clothing will provide the greatest protection for troops under all conditions; will be comfortable, yet efficient and durable. Our advance in all matériel will keep us in the forefront and enable us to do our part toward maintaining a peace which all desire.

The committee has been assured that every effort is being, and will be made, to coordinate the efforts of the several development agencies to utilizing in the

most efficient manner, both time and money in the accomplishment of the research and development goal above set forth. The committee has not reduced the funds requested for this activity; its only admonition is that the expenditure be administered carefully with the purpose of accomplishing maximum results.

The committee recognizes that the research and development program will not and should not fluctuate with the size of the Army. In order to maintain progress and secure maximum results consistent with economy and efficiency, a relatively constant level of funds must be made available year by year for this activity. Otherwise, projects of great potentiality might have to be abandoned after only getting well under way. This would be waste. The funds recommended are, in the committee's opinion, the least which can insure economical continuance of the research and development program.

#### ARMY AIR FORCES

Events of the past few years have made it clear that the Army Air Forces have kept pace with other branches of our Army to produce the most powerful offensive fighting force the world has ever known. Many components go into a complete and rounded-out Air Force—not the least of which is the industrial capacity of our Nation to produce and place at the disposal of the trained Army personnel planes in large numbers which are unsurpassed in quality.

It was clearly pointed out by officials of the Army Air Forces, and I wish to call it to the attention of the Members of this body, that the mission of this branch of the Army is to provide the Air Force elements of national security. In recent years it has frequently been referred to as the "first line of defense," thus displacing claims made on behalf of the Navy for many years. But whether or not it is the "first line of defense," it is the force in our Army that can bring the policy of one of the great generals of our Nation to fruition. I refer to Gen. Nathan Bedford Forrest and his memorable statement that has become a classic, that he won his battles by getting "there fustest with the mostest." The Army Air Forces places our Nation in that position.

It is not my purpose here, however, to eulogize the Air Forces. All of you are familiar with their accomplishments. I do wish to point out some of the problems that confront this component of our Army, and as their problems become the problems of this body, it devolves upon us to provide the directorship and means of coping with the questions presented to the Army Air Forces.

From the time of Pearl Harbor to VJ-day there was an ever increasing production of Air Forces needs. That production, of course, came from the industrial capacity of our Nation. Since VJ-day the demand for the type of production required in wartime has slackened because the civilian economy does not require the same type of equipment and supplies used for war purposes. The question then arises as to how it will be possible to keep a sufficiency of the war-

time type of capacity to meet an emergency should one arise. This is not a question solely with the Air Forces, it reaches into many other components of the armed forces, especially Ordnance. Insofar as the Air Corps is concerned the committee has approved in large part the requests for funds needed to keep industrial capacity in a position to quickly expand to meet required needs. It is necessary to keep abreast of scientific developments by producing new designs and prototypes of planes that may be used for testing purposes. It is necessary also to keep the aircraft industry sufficiently occupied that its capacity to produce the planes and other equipment and supplies needed will not be lost. There must be an even flow of work for the aircraft industry year after year to keep it current on required needs and to have a skeleton force which may quickly be expanded and built up to a place where emergency requirements can be met.

The present budget estimates for new aircraft is \$440,000,000. A majority of the committee having ever in mind the need to reduce expenditures as much as possible have agreed on a reduction of 10 percent or \$44,000,000. This will reduce the number of new aircraft from the requested 932 to approximately 800. A reduction of approximately 11 percent is recommended in the item for fuel and oil for aircraft as with fewer planes these requirements should not be as great.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. The latest figures from the Air Force, which were not available earlier in the hearings, show that 932 airplanes could not be produced with that money, but that only 749 could be produced and that the cut made by the committee would reduce the airplane procurement program from the highest estimate of 932 down to 561 planes. That is brought about by the reduction of the committee and the increase in the cost of airplanes. It is brought about by several factors.

Mr. KERR. I think, of course, that the gentleman's statement is correct. But you know what the information of the committee is. We now have 30,000 airplanes.

Mr. MAHON. To all intents and purposes, some of our planes might just as well be denominated as cracker boxes, because in modern warfare they would not be first-line aircraft. Our number of first-line aircraft is certainly nothing like approaching what it should be.

Mr. KERR. Has the gentleman any idea of what our number of first-class aircraft is?

Mr. MAHON. I might make a guess, but I do not have any definite figures from the War Department. But it remains to be seen how these old stored aircraft will work if we should happen to need them in time of an emergency.

Mr. KERR. Well, you ought to complain to the War Department which has charge of the development of the Air Forces. They have told us how many planes which this money we have appropriated will make. It looks like you

could have gotten from them the information as to how many we have available for fighting purposes now. There is no question but that we have got 30,000 of them distributed all over this Nation.

Mr. MAHON. Many of those 30,000 are out in the weather deteriorating and will probably never be used. The War Department will tell the members of this committee how many first-class aircraft we have—bombers and fighters—but I doubt that we would want to make public the intimate details of that. I know the most intimate details do not appear in our hearings and I would not take the responsibility of making it public on the floor.

Mr. KERR. I regret that the gentleman did not get that information and tell this committee about it if it was so important.

Small reductions in other items are recommended which in addition to reductions recommended in civilian personnel bring the total reductions recommended to \$116,667,492, or approximately 13.3 percent reduction from the budget estimate.

I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the gentleman handled the situation very well. I was going to make a comment on the observations of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. I think the gentleman from North Carolina made appropriate answer. I might say more about it later. I thank the gentleman.

#### CONTRACT AUTHORITY

Mr. KERR. The bill provides for contract authorization of \$280,000,000 for the procurement of aircraft, equipment, spare parts and accessories which will carry the program into future years and provide an even flow of orders for the aircraft industry.

I wish to point out if the Congress agrees to handling the additional authority for \$280,000,000 on a contractual authority basis, it is obligating the Government to appropriate in the future the funds required to pay for the aircraft, equipment, and so forth, procured under the authority exercised during the fiscal year 1948. The policy of granting contractual authority has not always been looked upon with favor as it may increase the cost of governmental operations and administration. This is especially true if the authorization includes numerous contracts. In the instant case, however, there should be relatively few contracts.

It has always given me pleasure to speak kindly of my fellowmen, and especially of those with whom I have worked in the performance of life's duties.

The clerks assigned to duty in the Appropriation Subcommittees of the House of Representatives have been men of highest character and outstanding intellect, and the responsibility placed upon them is rarely appraised as it should be.

Robert E. Lambert, the efficient clerk of the War Appropriations Subcommittee, deserves the highest meed of praise for the service he has rendered our subcommittee, and I know that each member joins with me in an expression of our deep appreciation for the splendid serv-

ice he has rendered in the preparation of the bill now before the House. Mr. Lambert has the highest ideals in respect to his work, and there is always indescribable superiority added to the character and fiber of the man who, always and everywhere, puts quality and efficiency into his work—this Mr. Lambert does.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] has again expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I will discuss the pending bill briefly, and I shall devote part of my remarks under general debate to the conference report of the conferees on the labor bill.

#### ARMY APPROPRIATIONS

First, however, I do want to say something about the Army appropriation bill. At the outset I should like to say that every member of the subcommittee who has worked under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], will agree with me, I am sure, in saying that we think we have the hardest working chairman in the House of Representatives. We have a chairman who puts in more detailed study on the hard plugging work of the preparation of a bill than any chairman that I know anything about, at least. And he gets results.

Last fall I had the feeling that the Congress would be called upon to make some reductions in appropriations, perhaps for the armed services, both the Army and the Navy. I wrote the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] when it was apparent that he would be chairman of the Appropriations Committee following the election, and I said that I felt if it became possible for the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations which dealt with budgets for the armed services to be merged or to coordinate their activities much as the Committees on Naval Affairs and Military Affairs are doing in the Armed Services Committee, this was a fitting time for the country to avail itself of the services of a man like AL ENGEL to take the leadership in coordinating expenditure for the two services. The Chairman has been diligent. We had longer hearings on the Army bill this year than we have had in the 8 years I have been a member of the subcommittee. We examined the estimates more in detail. The printed hearings, I think, are the longest we have ever had. Following the hearings on the bill itself we spent more days in actually marking up the bill and examining the individual items than has been done in the 8 years I have been on the committee. That is a sample of the thoroughness with which the bill has been prepared under the leadership of the gentleman from Michigan.

The country, I believe, wants to know that the Army bill and the Navy bill provide for security; at the same time they do want some reduction in the general expenditures of the Federal Government. I was interested in the way in which headlines told of the reporting of the Army appropriation bill the other day. They talked about the total of the

bill and then said that the reductions proposed amounted to something over 8 percent. They said that was a modest percentage in comparison with the percentage cuts on many of the other bills. Whether they said it critically or approvingly varied with different papers; but it should be pointed out that in dealing with the Army first of all you must consider the size of the Army.

If the size of the Army is once determined then you have automatically fixed a certain amount of money required for pay and subsistence, and other allowances of the members of the Army. The pay of the Army is fixed by statute. Subsistence, of course, reflects the cost of living.

It is estimated that every enlisted man in the Army costs the Federal Government \$3,150 for his pay, his clothing, his subsistence, and other allowances. The figures for officers are approximately \$5,500; that is the average for the officers of various ranks. Both of these figures go higher if part of the Army is overseas, and about half of our Army is overseas. Taking these figures just as an average, if you have an Army of 1,070,000 men, with approximately 130,000 officers and warrant officers you can readily figure out what money is untouchable. Multiply the 130,000 by \$5,000 for even figures and you have \$650,000,000 required for the officers. Take the remaining number of men, 950,000 enlisted men and multiply that by \$3,100, the average, you have something over \$2,900,000,000.

If you add the \$2,900,000,000 to the \$650,000,000 you have \$3,500,000,000 to start with as the amount required for pay, subsistence, and allowances in which no cuts can be made. The only way to reduce that would be to reduce the number of officers or men.

The military budget came to this subcommittee with budget estimates amounting to about \$5,700,000,000. When you subtract the \$3,500,000,000 required for, say, subsistence and allowance, you have left about \$2,100,000,000 where you can operate for the purpose of making reductions. The reductions proposed by the committee total \$475,000,000. It is obvious that \$475,000,000 is more than 20 percent of the \$2,100,000,000 that you have in the field where you can operate for the cuts.

Then, you add to that the principle that the committee took, namely, that we were not going to cut funds for research and development, and you take off another quarter of a billion dollars. You then have a 25-percent cut in items, exclusive of pay, subsistence, and allowances and funds for research and development.

This bill carries approximately \$222,000,000 for research and development. It also carries approximately \$23,000,000 for industrial mobilization, almost equally important.

The committee, and rightfully in my judgment, took the position that research and development should not be curtailed. We were aware of the fact that last year after we appropriated funds for research and development the President and the Bureau of the Budget proposed to impound around \$100,000,000 that the Con-



gress had appropriated for research and development. There apparently was some protest in Army circles on that figure, and as a result of a reexamination and a visit to Wright Field, where the Air Forces have their research division, the \$100,000,000 that was to be cut back was reduced to \$75,000,000. The \$75,000,000 of the Air Forces' research and development money was frozen or impounded, and subsequently it was transferred to other purposes of the War Department. It was used in part to take care of the pay of the Army, the pay of the civilian employees; so that last year \$75,000,000 that the Air Force should have had for research and development was used for other purposes.

Gen. Curtis Le May, who was head of the Twentieth Air Force, the B-29's in the Pacific, in response to questioning testified before our committee that that cut-back had delayed the research program anywhere from 8 months to a year and a half. He explained to us that a research program was not something that you could pick up now and accomplish in a few months' time but that research requires advance planning if you are going to carry it forward and use the different new devices in planes. You have to do your technical work on these devices, you have to put them on the planes. Sometimes you have to redesign the planes in order to accommodate the new instruments that you propose to put in them.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. Would it be the gentleman's judgment that such action on the part of the Executive was damaging to the national defense program?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. We did not think it helped at all and that is why the committee took the position we would not cut this \$222,000,000 which was requested by the budget for research and development at this time. We wanted to give the Air Corps an opportunity to get caught up.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I am in thorough accord with the committee's action in not cutting down the appropriation for research. Is there any way in which we can prevent similar action being taken next year by the Executive?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wish I knew. We asked that question during the hearings. I do not know whether it shows on the record or not. It may have been asked off the record. There was some division of opinion as to how the Congress, if it wanted to prevent appropriated funds from being impounded by the executive branch of the Government, could accomplish it. That has been raised in connection with other appropriation bills.

I think I can say that we made it perfectly clear to those who were before us that we expected them to go ahead with the program for which we were appropriating funds. At the same time it must be recognized that the President is Com-

mander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and that as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, if he directs officers in the Military or Naval Establishments to do certain things, as a matter of discipline and obedience they will follow his directives.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I think it is probably very clear that it would be impossible, certainly most difficult, for the Congress to compel the Army to spend a certain amount of this fund on research. At the same time, I think it is within our power and our province to prevent the transfer of this fund to any other purpose.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And this bill, I may say, comes to you without a transfer clause in it. They are not going to transfer this money to some purpose other than that to which it is appropriated.

Mr. PLOESER. I think that is tremendously beneficial, in view of the fact that we have known that they transferred it to keep more unnecessary civilian employees cluttering up the War Department.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Perhaps we have taken care of that, too. On pages 5, 6, and 7 of the committee report you will find tables showing various divisions of the War Department, the number of requested positions for civilian employees, the reduction proposed by the committee, the percentage reduction, the number of the reductions, the estimated cost for the full number requested and the reduction in dollars applied.

Thus, the committee has made perfectly clear where the reductions in the number of civilian personnel are to take place, both in percentage as well as in dollars.

Now, there is one other branch of the War Department's activities where we proposed that no cuts be made, and that is in the National Guard. With some of the members of the committee I felt at different times that the National Guard had been overlooked. There is a little tendency, I think, on the part of some career men in the Army to look down a bit at the National Guard. Yet the fact remains that when we get into an emergency we always call upon the guard. Under any logical interpretation of the kind of attack that might come to this country, we can expect attacks at various parts of the country if war should come again. We cannot expect to escape attack here. We can expect that these attacks will come with suddenness; they will be surprise attacks. That to me, and I think to the members of the committee, means we should have in all parts of the country a good organized group of trained people who can be called together quickly, who will know how to respond to discipline to take charge of any situation that might arise. So, the committee proposed that no cuts should be made in the funds requested for the National Guard.

We also looked with a friendly eye toward the Organized Reserves. There was some slight cut of their civilian personnel, but for the Organized Reserves proper we did not propose any cut. If further cuts are to be made in the bill,

or if cuts are to be made in military appropriations, I think you would have to turn to cutting the size of the Army itself. That involves a broad question of national policy which ought not really to be handled in this bill. If it could not be handled any other way, that question should be raised here, perhaps, but it is not the normal place to do it.

A very distinguished gentleman, a former President of the United States, who appeared before the subcommittee in connection with certain estimates which we considered, said to the members of the committee that he thinks that our Army in Germany is either too large or too little; too little to stop the advance of any enemy forces if they were to be attacked, and too large for a purely police job. That is a point of view which has some justification, I think. However, a decision as to whether or not we should reduce our armed forces overseas is a matter of broad policy.

I recall that the morning after General Marshall returned from Moscow, in a review article written by Frederick Kuhn, I believe, which appeared in the press services of the country, it was stated that the one tangible result of the Moscow Conference was an agreement that the several occupying powers should by the 1st of June report a proposed reduction of the number of troops in the occupying forces, to become effective not later than the 1st of September. On the 1st of June, or thereabouts, a report appeared in the press that the various representatives of the several occupying powers had been unable to get together on an agreement as to what that reduction should be.

I personally feel that if we are going to achieve further economies in our military budget, we must turn more and more of the job of military government and of preserving order in the occupied countries upon the native people themselves. Very substantial reductions can be made when we decide to do that. Whether or not the United States would want to do it in advance of an agreement with other powers is a question of policy that I hardly think can appropriately be determined in the consideration of the military bill. If I thought it could, I would be in favor of proposing, of course, to reduce the total number of the armed forces overseas.

So much for the military bill. If the Members of the Committee during this period of general debate will indulge me, I should like to turn now to a little discussion of the so-called Taft-Hartley bill, the labor bill, as it appears now in the form of this committee print of the conferees, which some of the Members have seen and on which the House will probably vote tomorrow.

It will be recalled that the House passed a labor bill by an overwhelming vote, about 3 to 1, or better; that it passed the other body; and the bill went to a conference committee. It will, of course, be recalled that last year we came to about the same position. We passed in the House of Representatives a bill dealing with labor problems. It was changed somewhat in the other body. We did not send that bill to conference. Some of us who were interested in it were successful in working with Members of the other

body so that amendments were incorporated in it so that when it came from the other body it was in about the same position as the bill had been when it passed the House. The House concurred in the Senate amendments, and the bill went to the White House and was vetoed.

The question arises now as to what is going to happen to the present labor bill. Having had some definite connection with the bill a year ago, I felt it at least a privilege if not a personal responsibility to form some opinion upon the content of the bill which will come from the conference committee today or tomorrow.

#### VETO OF LABOR BILL INCONCEIVABLE

As I have gone through that conference committee report I have come to the conclusion that it is inconceivable that President Truman will veto the Taft-Hartley labor bill as it has come from the conferees of the House and Senate. It is inconceivable that the President should veto the bill, that is, if he is to do it on the ground that this bill carries any wallop against organized labor.

The new labor bill as written by the conferees does many things, but it certainly does not destroy organized labor. On the contrary, it says that if a majority of the employees of a given employer eligible to vote authorize it, a union may bargain with the employer to require that every employee and all new employees shall join the union within 30 days. That is, by a simple majority vote, all workers may be required to pay initiation fees and dues.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 16 additional minutes.

If anything, this statutory recognition will strengthen organized labor and bring unions into many plants which heretofore have been open shops. In the face of that one provision alone, I do not see how organized labor can even ask the President to veto the bill.

The new labor bill as it comes from the conferees is weakest, in my personal opinion, in the approach it makes to the \$64 question of the strikes that tie up the Nation, the strikes that affect the general welfare, health, and safety. All that the bill proposes is a 60-day cooling-off period, enforceable by power for the Attorney General to get an injunction while a committee of inquiry reports on the facts, but is forbidden even to make recommendations for settlement. At the end of 60 days, the Mediation Service reports to the President on the progress toward settlement, if any, and the injunction is dissolved.

The only affirmative step is that within 15 days after the board of inquiry reports, the National Labor Relations Board is required to take a secret ballot of the employees on the latest offer of settlement made by the employer. There is not the slightest compulsion in the bill upon either party to seek a settlement. I have been unable to find any device in the bill which would seek to bring the play of any

persuasion, natural or legal, upon either party. In fact, the bill expressly says:

Neither party shall be under any duty to accept, in whole or in part, any proposal of settlement made by the Service.

That is about the nearest to a feather-duster solution I have ever seen proposed for national paralysis strikes. Certainly the man who came before Congress and asked for a draft of the railway workers to end the railroad strike can never veto this bill on the ground that it is too tough. As a matter of fact, the bill bows itself away from even the feather-duster approach to final strikes in railway disputes by expressly providing that—

The provisions of this title shall not be applicable with respect to any matter which is subject to the provisions of the Railway Labor Act.

In other words, if a situation develops again as developed with the railroads there will be nothing more to deal with the situation than we had the last time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If John L. Lewis were to call a strike in the coal industry, what remedy would there be under this bill other than the 60-day postponement?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not find any.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not either.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Under the provisions of this bill, John L. Lewis could not by his own act call a strike. Is that not true? In other words, there must be a vote by secret ballot. Is that not correct?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Well, it might be a secret ballot. If John L. Lewis continues as he has, I imagine he would be able to get the secret verdict he wants.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. That would depend on how the miners voted.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In any event, when the strike is called, what does this bill offer? It offers a chance to ask the Attorney General to get a 60-day injunction and when those 60 days have expired and the report is made of whatever steps have been taken, and the report may not bring in recommendations, the injunction is dissolved. The bill says:

The Attorney General shall move for a dissolution of the injunction.

There you are.

The bill offers only one further step in the matter of strikes which the President thinks affect the national health or safety. When the injunction is dissolved the President is required to submit to the Congress a report of the proceedings with recommendations if he has any to make. What is then to happen if Congress is not in session, the bill does not say.

So, it is my personal opinion that the bill does not come to grips with the problem of the national welfare strike in the way that problem must be faced and met.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. HALE. Does not the gentleman think that ad hoc legislation offered in an emergency is almost certain to be bad?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The recommendation which the President asked in that certain emergency, I think, was bad. That is the kind of situation we are left with, even if the Congress were in session and the President came up with some emergency legislation which would be as the gentleman has described it, written hurriedly and poorly checked. The ad hoc bill which the President sent up in the railroad emergency last year, as I recall, proposed to give him the right to draft railroad workers by declaring an emergency which he alone could end. That was the form of the bill as it came up to Congress. So I do not like this feature of the conference bill which leaves an answer to general strikes to be found when the emergency arises.

On the other hand, the bill does provide many salutary improvements in existing law. None of these changes afford a ground for veto; on the contrary, they constitute the positive reasons why the Congress should send the bill to the White House and why the President should sign it into law.

First of all, the bill rewrites the Wagner Act in the light of the 12 years of experience we have had in its operation. Any law of a general character, pioneering in a field as temperamental as industrial relations, can well afford examination and revision in the light of its actual workings.

The Taft-Hartley bill establishes a list of unfair labor practices for labor organizations or their agents corresponding to the unfair labor practices established in the original Wagner Act for employers. In this respect, the bill is similar to the revised bill which I introduced at the opening of this session of Congress, H. R. 725.

Among the matters dealt with by this device are featherbedding, jurisdictional disputes and secondary boycotts, refusals to bargain with employers, coercion of workers, discrimination in employment, and freedom of speech for the employer. I may say, however, that the language on freedom of speech leaves much to be desired, in my opinion.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. When you go out and talk to your constituents you tell them if they elect you Congressman they will get benefits. They will get a good Congressman. If they elect the other fellow they will not get quite so good a Congressman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not say much about the other fellow.

Mr. HOFFMAN. At least you lead them to believe that if they elect you they will get a good Congressman. Otherwise you would not be a candidate. This provision about free speech provides that he can give a speech if he does not make any threats or offer any benefits. How can you make a speech unless your heart is in it and you can offer benefits?



Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman answers his own question.

Only time will tell how effectively these problems are treated, but at least a definite legal ground work is laid for dealing with these matters.

In my judgment, this is progress. The measure of the progress will rest to a large extent with the National Labor Relations Board which is to be enlarged from three to five members, and its functions made more clearly policy making and less administrative. This change in the composition of the Board, and its field, incidentally, is one which I endorse and was first proposed, I believe in the bill, H. R. 725, which I introduced early in January, as previously mentioned.

Also, in the first title of the bill, the procedural provisions of the old National Labor Relations Act have been improved and made to conform more nearly to approved equity practice. These are matters of detail, but important and worth while in any comprehensive approach to the field of labor legislation.

Certainly there is nothing in this general revision of the Wagner Act which would afford the President any consolation for a veto, much less justification. He might pick out a phrase here or there of a picayunish character that he would rewrite, but surely he would find many more objectionable phrases in the original Wagner Act as it now stands on the statute books.

Title II of the bill established a Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service as an independent agency of the Government, merging with it the Conciliation Service now located in the Department of Labor. Although the President objected to the provisions in the vetoed Case bill of last year which took the Conciliation Service out of the Department of Labor, there is good reason to believe that he would not veto a bill this year on that ground.

Certainly those who have followed the course of labor legislation will be impressed by the number of people, both those known as radical and as conservative, who believe the Conciliation or Mediation Service should be independent and utterly above suspicion of bias or control.

The bill introduces a new and generally well recommended device in the form of a National Labor-Management Panel to assist the Mediation Service in its efforts to avoid industrial controversies and to achieve voluntary adjustments of controversies that do arise.

The principle of mediation and conciliation is well established. It is recognized in the present Conciliation Service. The changes proposed here by statute correspond in a general way to procedures that have been more or less formalized by administrative orders in present practice. Certainly, nothing in this part of the bill affords any ground for a Presidential veto on that score. Indeed, this portion of the bill the President may welcome if grapevine rumors of his displeasure with some operations of the present Conciliation Service have any foundation.

The Taft-Hartley bill incorporates some other provisions which were in the Case bill of last year and which are pretty

much accepted as proper subjects of legislation.

For instance, the bill establishes suitability for and by labor organizations as entities. The bill last year did that. The objection to suits against labor organizations has stemmed from a proper resentment against the travesty that took place in the old Danbury Hatters case where individual members of a union were harried and their property attached to satisfy a judgment for action taken by officers whom they did not control. It was as bad as such action would be against minority and individual stockholders of a corporation for acts they could not control. Both in the bill last year, and in this Taft-Hartley bill, the language while making labor organizations responsible under their contracts and for the acts of their agents, limits judgments to the assets of the organization itself.

The bill, as did the bill vetoed last year, requires that welfare funds be administered on a trust basis if the employer contributes to them. In this respect, the conference bill, in my opinion, is an improvement over the House bill which forbade welfare funds altogether and did not even permit employer payment or contribution to the mutual-aid or benefit-insurance funds many well-established and well-respected labor organizations and craft lodges have maintained for many years. Certainly this feature will not invite a Presidential veto. It should be welcomed by organized labor.

The bill incorporates other features which are generally accepted as appropriate items in any modern labor legislation.

The ban on political contributions which has been the law as a part of the Smith-Connally Act now expiring, is picked up and extended to primaries and conventions as well as general elections.

There is a ban on strikes by Government employees which is in keeping with stated governmental policy and certainly will not prompt a veto.

There is a provision to protect labor organizations from having officers who are members of the Communist Party. It relieves the National Labor Relations Board from investigating matters raised by labor organizations unless the organization has on file an affidavit that its officers are not members of the Communist Party and have not been within the preceding 12 months. Surely the rank and file of sturdy American workers will welcome that protection and the President will hardly deny it to them by vetoing the bill because that is offered.

There is one significant portion of the bill, title IV, which definitely bids for Presidential support. It proposes to create a joint committee from the Senate and House Committees on Labor to study basic problems affecting friendly labor relations and productivity and report by March 15, 1948, with recommendations. Since the President made such a recommendation on the subject in a special message to the Congress a year ago, he certainly will not veto the bill on the ground that it carries such a provision.

Taken in a broad way, then, the Taft-Hartley bill offers some improvements in existing law, writes into law some gen-

erally approved practices, and offers one method, gentle though it be, of recognizing that a national emergency may exist in case of a strike affecting national health or safety.

If political lieutenants or so-called leaders of labor brandish old, hackneyed phrases about vicious or drastic antilabor legislation, and browbeat the President into veto of this bill, America will have witnessed gangsters entering the White House and holding up the President with a wooden gun.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In other words, summarizing the bill—and I appreciate the fine statement the gentleman has just made—is there anything, in the gentleman's opinion, in the bill that would do any harm to any legitimate organized labor union that is organized for the benefit of its membership?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Absolutely not.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Is it the gentleman's opinion that the prosecutive and judicial functions of the National Labor Relations Board are separated far enough that they will be performed equitably?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think there is an improvement in the bill in that respect. I did not mention that feature. I do think that improves the present Wagner Act. The new National Labor Relations Board will become more of a policy-making board, more of a quasi-judicial board. The investigatory functions are separated from the duties of the individual board members. This is a change from the way they operated in the past.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. The gentleman has made a splendid analysis of the conference report. I wish to compliment him. Does not the gentleman believe that this bill can be designated as neither pro-labor nor pro-management but as a middle of the road bill fair to both parties?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It certainly is a fair bill. It is not either pro-labor or pro-management. As I stated in the first part of my remarks I do not think it goes as far as it should in dealing with national welfare strikes. I think it goes farther than it should in encouraging the establishment of union shops with compulsory membership by a simple majority vote of the employees of a given employer. I think it should have done something more to regulate mass picketing activities. The gentleman is probably warranted in describing it as a middle-of-the-road bill.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Speaking in generalities, may I ask the gentleman whether in his opinion this bill by its terms even approaches in severity the bill which the

President stood in this House and advocated last year?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Certainly not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the members of the subcommittee have already been complimented, including our able and efficient clerk, Mr. Robert Lambert, who has been working with intelligence and energy on a day-and-night basis for weeks trying to whip this bill into shape for presentation to the House. The virtues of our chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], have not been overestimated. I have observed in my service here that occasionally a member will arise and extol the virtues of a colleague, his statesmanship, his capacity, but finally makes some reservations which take away the spirit of the compliment. Well, I have no reservations with respect to my chairman. I yield to no one in my admiration for his energy and effort. He is an able and diligent servant of the American people. Of course, I do not always agree with him, and I am sure he would not expect me to.

I want to say at the outset that this bill—the appropriation bill for the War Department for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947—is to me very unacceptable in some particulars and I want to make reference now to one particular in which it is most unacceptable from my standpoint. I shall offer an amendment, not as a token amendment, not merely for the record, but with the hope of getting results, an amendment which will restore the airplane-production program requested by General Spaatz, Chief of the Army Air Forces, who plead with this Committee almost on bended knees to give him this money for what he called an already greatly impoverished air force. I think that the money requested for aircraft procurement ought to be restored and I think when the President of the United States affixes his signature to this bill it will have been restored. I make that prediction now for the record.

The bill provides for a reduction below the estimates of the President's budget in the sum of \$475,000,000. I am not now going to offer amendments to restore more than \$40,000,000 of that sum. I do think that some of the cuts were too deep and that we cannot save the amounts that we undertook to save here. I think we can probably save several hundred million dollars but I feel that we should proceed with caution. It would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of a strong national defense program in these days of uncertainty.

Let no one mistake the position of the members of this committee. We are all favorable toward economy and good government. No one in America of either political party has a monopoly upon that virtue. When the able chairman of our committee early in the session stood athwart the path of Government spending he expressed the fervent hope that appropriations in this bill could be cut by \$1,000,000,000. It has been my hope

and belief that substantial savings could safely be made. In my opinion further study by the War Department of the present bill will reveal that additional changes will be in the public interest.

Now, we marked up this bill after several days of deliberation and we put our pencils down, and I, for one, thought that we had agreed in subcommittee on the final draft of the measure, having begun consideration of the bill on February 17. But, after we had marked up the bill the subcommittee was called back into session. That was about the time that the Navy bill was to be reported out, and it was then stated that an effort would be made to cut the funds in the bill for the aviation-procurement program. I protested then, as I protest now, the action of the committee in reducing the airplane-procurement program for the United States Army Air Forces.

In the committee report which was originally prepared I protested the fact that in the report as then written there was only one line in the whole report which made reference to the procurement of airplanes, and that was over in a table in the latter part of the document.

Following my protestations, which must have been considered valid, the chairman of our committee has written now on pages 8 and 9 of the report a statement in considerable detail regarding the aviation program. I thought that the committee should be forthright with the country and the Congress and say exactly what was being done by way of reducing the aircraft procurement program. If any justification existed for such action it should have been plainly set forth. But the original report did not give to the Congress and the press of the country an accurate statement as to that situation, and as a result, on Thursday, May 29, the Evening Star, of Washington, which is one of the most reputable papers in the Nation, came out with a three-column headline making reference to the Army military budget cut of 8 percent and in a subheadline the Evening Star said the following:

"\$5,240,982,423 fund includes full plane, research requests."

Well, the bill did nothing of the kind, and of course, nobody now maintains that it did do anything of the kind. But it was unfortunate that this sort of information was at first accepted as the correct statement of the situation by the press.

Now, we do have 30,000 planes, but as I said earlier in the discussion today, some of them are little more than cracker boxes. Many of them, many thousands, in fact, are out in the open. It remains to be seen how well they will weather the ravages of time. Certainly by the thousands they are becoming unusable year by year. No one would say that we have more than 9,000 first line aircraft. I do not have the exact figures before me. No one would say that all of them would be readily usable.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. With respect to the airplanes, what excuse is there for having

destroyed quite a number of B-29 airplanes that were in the process of being built and almost completed at the close of hostilities? Quite a number of B-29 airplanes were in the process of construction at that time, a great many of them almost completed. They made junk out of them, destroyed them. In view of the gentleman's statement, what excuse could there be for that sort of policy?

Mr. MAHON. I think there could be no excuse any time for the destruction of first-rate B-29 aircraft. I have no information indicating that completed B-29 aircraft may have been destroyed. If the gentleman wishes to pursue that question, I wish he would get his own time, because I am not familiar with the facts about which he is now speaking. Undoubtedly there was a cut-back in plane production when the war ended and production stopped on B-29's just starting down the assembly line.

Mr. REES. I shall be glad to furnish the gentleman information on that subject.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. Does not the gentleman take the position that whatever may have been done in the past which was wrong or unjustified, the idea now is, as the possessor of atomic energy, and with the necessity for building up experimental planes to utilize jet propulsion, that the small number of planes, some 900, asked for by the War Department is certainly a minimum for us to proceed with experimentation on planes that would be essential in the event of another emergency?

Mr. MAHON. Yes, the gentleman makes a very fine point. I am not one who is willing to look backward when it comes to the matter of aviation, nor am I one who is willing to be other than very enthusiastic for the expansion of our aviation program. The fact that in the committee report as it was originally drafted there was only one line about the airplane procurement program, which looms as one of the large items in the bill, \$440,000,000, would leave the implication that those who had written the report were not air-minded. I cannot feel that this is true, but that is the logical deduction.

The gentleman will remember that following World War I some of the nations tried to hold onto their old equipment, and looked to that equipment for security. That fact contributed somewhat to disastrous consequences later. If America today spends a lot of time looking for security to old, antiquated aircraft that we have on hand, America will be inviting trouble in the battle for post-war supremacy. I, for one, am not as much concerned about what we have or what we had, as I am with the possibilities for the future. It is in the future that the hope of our country lies.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. Would not the gentleman feel it would be only fair to say



that when the war ended even the B-29 was not the latest, most efficient, and most effective type of heavy aircraft being produced?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct. Of course, that would not justify the discarding of first-rate B-29 aircraft.

Mr. KILDAY. If the gentleman will yield further, I believe the gentleman would agree with me that neither of us would support an appropriation to build any large number of the conventional-type airplanes or the type that we used during the last war. Admitting that the B-29 is the best that any nation has at this time, still I would not be willing to go ahead and build a large number of B-29's certainly not B-17's, P-51's, or P-47's, but I would be willing to go along with experimentation and development so that we can properly utilize jet propulsion and perhaps atomic propulsion, and certainly the type of airplane that would be in a position to utilize the atomic bomb.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct. Other nations of the world are interested in aircraft. Since I came on the floor the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] has shown me a newspaper clipping to the effect that one of the great nations of the world is contemplating a 100,000-airplane-procurement program. I doubt that such a statement as that is entirely authentic, but to me it is unthinkable at this time before the peace has been written and when there are perils on every side and when the streamer headline of one of the papers in Washington, D. C., said yesterday, "The United States warned to get set for atomic warfare," I say it is unthinkable that we would refuse to give the Army Air Forces, the queen of the skies up to this day and forever the queen of the skies so far as I am concerned, that we would deny General Spaatz's plea and the earnest appeal of our President for 749 planes as carried in the budget.

I say, Mr. President, and I say, General Spaatz, and I know that the General would agree with me, "You have not asked for enough planes for the Army Air Forces." Certainly, I shall not take the responsibility for reducing the number of the planes requested.

On all these controversial and complicated issues that come before the Congress, it is never quite possible to tell just how certain members feel about different questions. Here, however, the point is easily discernible, the point is well drawn and very simple. We will have a chance to vote on it, and every man can record his position and write it in the RECORD as to whether or not he is for a first-rate aircraft program as requested by the Chief of the Air Forces and the President of the United States. If Members vote for my amendment to restore 188 tactical aircraft—jet propulsion bombers and fighters and planes of that type—then they are voting for the kind of air force I believe we need. If Members want to record themselves as voting to the contrary, that is the privilege of a Member of the House of Representatives.

I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] who, in my opinion, will probably be willing to support this

amendment before this bill goes to the White House.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As the gentleman knows, because he was in the committee, I was not enthusiastic about this particular reduction at this time.

Mr. MAHON. That is right.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But there is something to be said for the point of view which was expressed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], and that was that the B-29 was more or less obsolete when we came through the war, and the viewpoint that finally prevailed with the majority of the committee was that we did not want to load the Air Force up with some obsolete planes. We wanted to say to the President that we want to save some money so that we would have it to spend on buying some modern aircraft after we get the benefit of the renewed research and development program which he had set back to the tune of \$75,000,000 last year.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. The research and development program is, of course, important, but, mind you, that nation is marked for trouble which waits until it has a perfect aircraft before it starts working on the production line. The gentleman from South Dakota knows, as I do, through long months of service on the committee, that every airplane that comes off the assembly line is at that moment to some degree obsolescent. We have appropriated and vouchsafed appropriations of money time and again for modification centers to take that new aircraft just off the assembly and put in the latest improvements that had been subsequently developed. So we cannot wait to get the last word in research before aircraft construction is begun. To do so would mean that no planes would ever be constructed.

If we did lose some time on research and development last year we cannot make it up now. We can only go on from here. It is like General Spaatz said on page 615 of the hearings:

We are not trying to make up that loss in 1948 appropriation. But we have taken the loss in time, so instead of the 5-year research and development program that would be finished in 1952, that project will now end in 1953 or 1954.

Please note this fact as to research and development: You can spend a billion dollars in research and development and it may not get results. We might have spent \$2,000,000,000 on the atomic bomb, as we did, and then it might not have worked. Research and development does not always work as planned, but I would not minimize the great importance of such activity.

So, what we will do with our future program is to use the best information we have in devising the best aircraft that can be produced.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. With reference to the remarks made by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] does the gentleman feel we should be concerned, if the Army Air Force got the 932 planes it originally hoped to get from the money

they asked for, or the 749 planes which it would actually buy because of the increase in price by the time the bill came here, or if it should get 561 which this bill would permit them to acquire, that there would be any danger of overloading the Army Air Force with antique types of planes?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has again expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Texas 10 additional minutes.

Mr. MAHON. It is unthinkable to me that any thoughtful person would say that with an air force of more than 300,000 men, 749 new planes would be too much for the air forces for training and for national security. At least we need a little nucleus of an air force of the most modern design if we are to train air personnel and if we are in the test tube of experience, to develop all the bugs and defects to the end that we may have better planes, more efficient, powerful, and safer for air force personnel.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There is one other factor that I think the committee should be aware of in its consideration of this procurement proposition. Some committee which has studied our airplane picture thinks that there should be about 3,000 planes a year produced, of a military character, for the Army and Navy.

Mr. MAHON. Yes. Will the gentleman permit me to say that the Army program as now written of 561 planes, plus the Navy program of 575 planes, would give us something less than 1,500 planes, and something like 1,500 planes short of what might be necessary for us to maintain the aircraft industry.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is the picture as far as current funds are concerned. Of course, that is not quite the entire picture. I know there are many Members on the floor who are really and sincerely trying to get at the bottom of this situation. I would like to have the Members refer to page 8, where you will find a listing, not merely of the new funds carried in this bill but of the items that are on order, the money unobligated, that was available for this purpose, and the contract authority in the bill. You will note there is a little table there which shows that on February 8, 1947, we had on order for the Air Corps \$616,523,000. There was also unobligated \$50,417,564 on that date. The bill provides \$396,000,000. Then the bill carries contract authority for \$280,000,000, making a new procurement total of \$1,342,940,571. It is a question on which experts could honestly disagree.

Mr. MAHON. But the experts in aviation do not disagree.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The question is how much you want to put into procurement until you have your research and development program brought up to date. I recall we had a somewhat similar occasion that arose before the war when General Arnold suggested to some members of the subcommittee that we ought not to go too strong

on the purchase of certain planes because he thought they would be obsolete by the time he got them and he wanted to get the benefit of some new research incorporated into the planes and did not want to get loaded up.

We do not want to get some more cracker boxes. The gentleman referred to cracker boxes.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman now let me proceed?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I will agree that men well may vary in their opinions as to how much we can appropriate to establish a certain policy. If we find that the domestic aircraft industry may not be able to turn out what we ought to have I will be inclined to go along with the gentleman if it comes to that point; but at the same time I do not think the country or the Congress ought to have an impression other than what is the truth, and that is that there is over \$1,342,000,000 for Air Force procurement.

Mr. MAHON. That is correct. Mr. Chairman, I must decline to yield further until I have proceeded with my statement.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman has quoted with approval the warning words of General Arnold as the yardstick which we should follow. Following out the same line of argument I have quoted the statement of General Spaatz, his successor; and I hope the gentleman will be willing, as I think he eventually will, to vote for my amendment. I think the Congress is for an adequate aircraft program and I know the people are for such a program. I think the Members of Congress will hesitate to say that they want fewer planes than the very minimum requested by the Chief of the Air Forces and the President of the United States.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I am one of those who is not on this committee and who is not on the Military Affairs Committee. I do not know much of the details, but as the matter strikes me what we have here is a question of whether we are going to defend America with outmoded equipment, second-rate or obsolete equipment, or whether we are going to carry out the promise that has been made to the American people of keeping American aviation second to none in the world.

Mr. MAHON. I know what the people I represent want—what the people of the Nation want. They want an air force second to none. They want economy, but they do not want it taken out of the Army Air Forces. They do not want Congress to proclaim to the world that America is weakening in her aviation program, that America is slipping, that America is cutting down the number of aircraft required for national security. I do not want to send that word to the capitals of the world and I do not propose to do so; and I do not think the Congress ought to do it. That is the reason I propose to offer this amendment later in the proceedings on this bill.

I should like to make this statement: Commercial aircraft are different from military aircraft. Commercial aviation companies cannot very well make combat planes. Combat airplane factories are required. I want you to hear what General Spaatz says with respect to the airplane industry. You will find it at page 603 of the hearings. He says a number of important things with respect to that matter, which I now quote:

General SPAATZ. I am gravely concerned that we are today rapidly losing one of our principal elements of national security. Our aircraft industry increased to a size where it was able to turn out 80,000 planes in a year in the last year of the last Great War. It was not able to arrive at that status until more than 5 years had elapsed after initial mobilization. We will not be given 5 years in which to prepare and build up to maximum output the next time. In 1948 our aircraft industry faces a prospect of building less than 1,500 planes. That means that the industry will practically disappear. In this unhappy event, the Nation will lose one of its prime resources for defensive and offensive strength. One of the essential elements of its war-making potential will have disappeared. I urge the Congress to realize the gravity of this situation and work out sound measures for maintaining the aircraft industry at the minimum level which, in my opinion, requires an annual production of about 3,000 planes.

The aviation industry cannot produce a few planes this year, fewer next year, and a great number the third year. There must be an even flow.

As the gentleman has so well pointed out the Air Forces already have hundreds of millions of dollars for the construction of aircraft that are coming off the assembly lines now and will continue to come off the assembly lines for 2 years. The planes that we are providing for in this bill will come off the assembly lines in about 2 years. We must project that production line forward.

I am advised that the military aviation industry is threatened by reason of the following conditions:

There is not enough business to keep the industry at a high tempo. The aviation plants are too large for the small amount of business which they have, but we cannot permit the junking and dismemberment of plant capacity because this capacity will be of the greatest importance if trouble comes. We have to be ready for it in our industrial mobilization program.

Our combat plane industry had a lot of foreign orders prior to and during the war. They no longer have that business. So it is up to us to be watchful, alert, and ready if we are to meet the difficulties which may befall us in the future.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. Our colleague is making a very able argument in support of his position. The thing that is almost past understanding with me is that the very able gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] made a fine argument in behalf of the item for research and development, yet I do not know what we need with so much money for research and development if we are not going

to put some of it into practical use. The committee seems to have done a good job in practicing economy in connection with a good many items. However, I belong to that school which believes that the very last thing we ought to cut in an appropriation bill such as this is the matter of airplanes and atomic energy. Forty million dollars, the amount that will be in the gentleman's amendment when he offers it, is not a drop in the bucket compared to the total in this appropriation bill. In view of present world conditions and also the advance in scientific development, there are two things that under no condition ought to be cut below what the experts tell us, experts such as, General Spaatz, General Arnold, and General Vandenberg, and I challenge anybody who is opposed to the gentleman's amendment to find a single man in a high place in the Air Corps who will not say that the last thing that ought to be cut in this bill is the matter of airplane production.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his timely comment. The argument is correct, it is unanswerable. It is in the heart of the American people to follow the philosophy which the gentleman has expressed and it is up to us in the Congress to follow it.

I should like to point out that we seem to have been conscious of the importance of aviation when we passed the Navy bill, because we did not reduce the procurement for the Navy. The Navy procurement program of 575 planes is greater in numbers than the procurement program in this bill for the Army. I have no jealousy as between the services, but if aviation was essential for national defense a week before last, why is it not a good thing now?

Mr. THOMASON. I am one of those who believes that under present world conditions we ought to have the best air force in the world. In view of this report and what the report says about the appropriation for air activities, I feel certain that we will soon be a second-rate power from an air force standpoint unless we take the necessary precautions. Drastic reduction in aircraft is a danger and a gamble we cannot afford to take under present world conditions.

Mr. MAHON. That is right, and it is up to us to furnish the leadership in this contest.

Mr. THOMASON. The very able chairman of this subcommittee who has contributed much, especially in the line of economy and economical government, could surely find some other places in this bill to dig out this \$40,000,000 and let this item be restored. There are plenty of us who are going along and will join the gentleman in his fight to restore the item for aircraft procurement.

Mr. MAHON. Let me say for the gentleman from Michigan that it was only



as a last resort and after the bill had been tentatively agreed to that this unwise reduction was made. One of the old-time hymns admonishes us to "yield not to temptation." At first the committee pushed aside the proposal to reduce the aircraft program but later yielded to the temptation to cut out the \$40,000,000. Yielding in this matter endangers our future security.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Will it not have an adverse effect? If I understood the gentleman's argument correctly, it seems to me he makes a very logical case that if we do not appropriate this money and keep a constant stream of money going into the military aircraft program we are going to put the military aircraft business out of being. If we do that, then seek to bring it back, each time we bring it back we increase greatly the cost of each individual plane. The cost of these planes is going to increase if we do not build them at a more or less level rate.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman has made a very fine point. The committee cut the procurement program from 749 planes to 561 planes. The cut in the funds was only 10 percent, but that cut is about 20 percent in aircraft. Going into the cost of the first planes is your engineering costs, and many such expenditures, but as you increase the number of units you bring down the per unit cost, and we can get so much more for our money if we will spend this additional \$40,000,000 which my amendment provides. In other words, we will get more for the \$40,000,000, which I include in my amendment, than we will probably get for much larger funds included in the bill, by reason of the fact so well pointed out by the gentleman from Texas.

Now, the bill does not cut research and development directly, except to this extent, that it reduces the number of officer personnel, some of whom are engaged in research and development. The Army of the future has got to be a smart Army. You cannot get men on low salaries to afford the leadership in research and development. You must have men of experience and capacity, and you must have top flight officers for much of that work, and this bill reduces rather drastically the officer personnel. The civilian personnel in the Department, having to do with research and development, has been to some extent reduced, if I understand correctly the implications of the bill before us as it applies to departmental personnel here in Washington.

I should like, if I have time, to make reference to the cut in the warrant officers. There are at present only about 5,200. The number is cut approximately in half. Now, a warrant officer position is something to which the enlisted man may look forward. He may become a warrant officer, and it has many advantages. It is something to stimulate his ambition for a life in the service. But, the bill reduces the warrant officers almost in half. It is like coming along and saying, "Reduce the

number of master sergeants." I say we ought to do everything in our power to encourage the enlisted men, and those who favor more opportunity for incentive for the enlisted man, I think, should deplore the action of the committee in reducing the warrant officers to the extent they were reduced.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, can the gentleman tell us how many warrant officers we will have under this bill?

Mr. MAHON. I think we have about 5,200 now, and the committee cut out something like 2,600, which leaves about 2,600. It is a very disturbing bombshell in the laps of the warrant officers of the Nation and a deterrent to incentive among the enlisted men.

Mr. THOMASON. In that connection, can the gentleman also tell us how many majors there are now in the Army?

Mr. MAHON. There are some very interesting facts in the hearings in regard to the military officer personnel. Page 1591 of the hearings indicates that we probably have about 18,000 majors.

Mr. THOMASON. I agree with the gentleman that we ought to provide an incentive for the enlisted men, even though we have to cut the officer personnel in some branches.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. MAHON. I would like to say by way of further compliment to the able chairman of the committee, that this hearing is the most understandable and valuable hearing that this subcommittee has ever held in its entire history, in my judgment. It contains more than 1,600 pages. It gives the answers to a lot of our questions, and if Members are interested enough, as I know they are, to know more about this aviation problem, and the amendment I expect to offer, I hope they will avail themselves of the opportunity to read those hearings.

Before I conclude I want to say that General Richards, the budget officer of the War Department, who has worked day and night in his job, and who has an amazing capacity for an understanding of the War Department program, and whose integrity and capacity have never been questioned, has given us every assistance. I am sure that all the members of the committee will be glad for me to express the high esteem in which we hold the able budget officer of the War Department, General Richards.

Mr. THOMASON. I am sure every Member of this House is interested in efficient and honest Government, but during the course of this very interesting debate the chairman of the committee alluded to the fact that he had tried to get two competent auditors to audit the War Department. Can the gentleman tell us whether or not the hearings have disclosed anything that is irregular or illegal or out of line in the activities of General Richards or anybody else in high authority in the War Department?

Mr. MAHON. May I say to the gentleman that the committee has no information which would give any implication at all of irregularity in the War Department. As a member of the Gov-

ernment Corporations subcommittee, I may say that we find that many of the Government corporations have different bookkeeping systems and the various departments of the Government have different bookkeeping systems. The procedure used varies with the department. As the gentleman knows, the accounts of the War Department are kept by the Chief of Finance and the responsibility for the accounting system rests with the Chief of Finance. No doubt he would welcome a complete audit by the General Accounting Office if Congress should desire that such be done.

For one, I feel that General Richards and General Eisenhower and Secretary of War Patterson have been very faithful in undertaking to perform the duties assigned to them.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LYLE. Here is a matter that bothers me in the consideration of appropriation bills for both the Army and the Navy. Do you arrive at what the Army needs in the interest of the country by what gentlemen like General Spaatz and General Eisenhower and men of that nature tell you, or do you take what they tell you and fit it to the demands of, let us say, the chairman of the committee, who says, "We can spare only so much next year in the defense of our country, and we are going to take what you say and cut it down to fit that." Tell me how you arrive at these things. There seems to be some misunderstanding about how you arrive at them.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will permit, my idea of proper procedure—

Mr. LYLE. Not "proper procedure"; how did you get at it? I know the gentleman's ideas of what is proper and I think they are right, but how did you get at it?

Mr. MAHON. Of course, there is and has been a great urgency to cut Government spending, and some suggestion had been made that a billion dollars could be cut off the War Department appropriation bill.

Mr. LYLE. Were you trying to fit it to the pattern, were you trying to fit it to the budget set out by Congress, or were you trying to fit it to the needs of defense of this Government in the face of its responsibilities, on the advice of men who know?

Mr. MAHON. I, myself, was trying to fit it to our American responsibility and our commitments of 1947 and 1948 and the years that are to come.

Mr. LYLE. I congratulate the gentleman. I believe that the principle he advocates is sound and is worth fighting for.

I can remember so well in 1944 on the beachhead of Anzio when we did not have enough airplanes, and men had to sit up 24 hours a day with their guns turned up into the air, cocked and ready to shoot because we did not have American planes to fly over and give those boys a moment to get any rest. I can remember too well when enemy air superiority gave us all sorts of bloodshed and white crosses. This Nation owes it to the people who fought and died and to unborn

generations never to get caught like that again.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his fine contribution. I have taken the time of the House to discuss this matter because I feel deeply what I am sure the gentleman from Texas, who served so valiantly during the war, feels even more deeply, that we cannot take the risk entailed in diminishing the strength of our Air Forces in the light of present world conditions.

Under leave granted, I wish to insert the following letter from the Secretary of War, which was addressed to the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] in response to our request for information as to the effect of the committee action in reducing funds requested for the Air Forces:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF WAR,  
June 2, 1947.

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CANNON: This is in response to your inquiry as to the effect upon the program of the Army Air Forces of a possible reduction in the estimates of funds for fiscal year 1948, for the procurement of new complete aircraft.

The budget estimate for the Army Air Forces for fiscal year 1948, as presented to the Congress, contains an item of \$440,000,000 which includes \$400,000,000 for the procurement of complete aircraft and \$40,000,000 for maintenance spare parts. This estimate, prepared in September 1946, contemplated the procurement of a total of 932 complete aircraft with related spare engines and spare parts based upon prices as of September 1, 1946. Since September 1, 1946, higher labor and material costs and essential equipment improvements have increased the total costs of aircraft to such an extent that, at current prices, the \$400,000,000 contained in the estimate for complete aircraft would now enable the procurement of approximately 749 complete aircraft, a reduction of 183, or 20 percent from that originally contemplated.

A reduction of \$40,000,000 in the budget estimate for this item would cause a further reduction in the number of aircraft which could be procured to approximately 561 aircraft or a total reduction of 371 aircraft, or 40 percent from that originally contemplated. This additional reduction of approximately 183 aircraft would eliminate the procurement of approximately 63 bomber and fighter aircraft and all of the scheduled 125 liaison aircraft. The application of the reduction would be made to those aircraft of lowest priority; the nonavailability of which would be least detrimental to the Air Forces.

Having in mind the need for utmost economy consistent with the minimum requirements of the Army Air Forces for our national defense, the estimate as submitted to the Congress did not provide for any training aircraft or other models of aircraft, the procurement of which could be deferred through the use of less modern and older aircraft. The estimate, except for 125 liaison aircraft of new design at a cost of approximately \$5,500,000, was almost wholly for the procurement of the most modern bombers, and jet fighters in quantities barely sufficient to sustain a relatively small efficient modern air force. Any dollar reduction would necessarily have to be taken practically entirely in the procurement of the latest models of bomber and fighter aircraft. This would be extremely detrimental to an already impoverished air force, one that is already short of the essential modern equipment required to maintain an air force of

the quality and efficiency which is critically essential in the event of an emergency.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,  
Secretary of War.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to pay tribute to the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], who for the past 4 months has worked hard, diligently, and accurately in holding hearings on this appropriation bill. At all times he was fair with and considerate of the witnesses appearing before us. I am greatly indebted to him personally for his many courtesies.

While the committee did not agree on everything, yet it is my opinion that the bill, as a whole, is for the best interest of the country today. I regret that illness prevented our very able colleague the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] from attending all our meetings.

The fiscal stability is a searching problem facing the American people now.

The huge Federal debt is of great concern to me. I presume it is of great concern to everyone here. As we know when a government cannot make both ends meet, it pays its bills by manufacturing the money needed. There are those who insist that it is all for good economy to place a back-breaking national mortgage on the children of the Nation yet unborn. Those of us who oppose that kind of reasoning are referred to as alarmists, even though we recite the facts and come in with the proof that our staggering national debt and continued large drains on the Federal Treasury mean bankruptcy. Very few individuals want to think that this great Nation of ours is headed for bankruptcy.

We, the representatives of the people, are charged with estimating as accurately as possible the revenue requirements. We are responsible for passing the controlling laws of expenditures. Our estimates of fiscal requirements for a fiscal year are based upon months and months of hearings and study. It is obvious that our estimates cannot be exact. There are too many factors entering into the plans and justifications of the Government departments to assume that our estimates could be exact.

What we think our fiscal requirements should be is one thing. What our judgment is on these requirements is another thing. For my part, and this is particularly true when considering the bill before us, I will follow the latter course.

I have reached this conclusion after sitting for weeks during our subcommittee hearings and helping to write the bill now under discussion. My decision has been reached as a result of careful consideration and deliberation. I pro-

pose to go into the estimates as to what is before us in a so-called general manner. I realize it would be irksome, if I were to analyze each item.

At this point I want to make it clear that I have never supported a measure which would weaken our national defense. I will not now become a party directly or indirectly whereby I could be charged with reducing the effects of our national defense. My position is that of helping the interests of the American people. I believe those interests are a demand for a moderate army here and abroad with extinction of waste, inefficiency, and duplication. These factors ought to receive the support of this Congress.

By reading the bill you will observe that nothing has been taken from the Medical Department, from the National Guard, and from the Reserve Corps. I also believe that these divisions deserve the strong support of Congress. Also, nothing has been deducted from research and development.

A reading of the hearings will convince anyone that a little less hedging is in order by the quartermaster service of the Army when testifying before the subcommittee on war appropriations.

The testimony before our committee shows that there has been great waste of food in the Army. This was admitted. Food which was wasted was deposited in the garbage can. The waste occurred here and abroad even while there was a great shortage of food.

On pages 295 and 296 of the hearings there is evidence that the Army is making every possible effort to remedy this situation. Food service schools, under the supervision of trained officers, have been set up, the purpose of which is to eliminate waste. We understand that the large turn-over in personnel has taken from the Army many good cooks and service officers, reasons which are somewhat accountable for the waste of food stuffs. Assurances were given us that trained men on food service would devote 100 percent of their time to work and study of this kind. This kind of training should promote food conservation.

On pages 321 to 325, inclusive, of the hearings there will be found testimony on the purchase of supplies and equipment for handling fuels and lubricants.

It is interesting to observe that 5-gallon drums and blitz cans are the same and not a new type can. There are 2 types of 5-gallon cans, some of which are used as water cans and others for lubricants. It seems that the Army had a surplus of these cans which were declared. After the surplus declaration was made to meet civilian demands the cans were advertised for as low as \$1.78 a piece. The original cost of these cans was over \$4 a piece.

We understand that the War Assets has 179,000 of these cans which the Army is trying to retrieve.

The testimony reveals that the surplus was declared on determination by a committee formed in the War Department, composed of War Department representatives and advisers who were members of



the Civilian Production Administration and the Office of Production Administration.

The officers of the War Department were ordered to declare the cans in question as surplus under instructions to dispose of a quantity of these items to meet civilian demands. A total of 1,577,856 cans were declared surplus, of which number 168,516 were recovered. This kind of practice clearly shows that those responsible for it have no regard for economy.

The War Department came before us and requested appropriations to purchase 703,000 cans at \$4.43 a piece. We could not be sold on their appeal of necessity in this case.

We reduced their over-all estimate for purchase of supplies and equipment for handling fuels and lubricants from seven million to five million.

On pages 326-328, inclusive, of the hearings there will be found testimony dealing with the purchase of fuels and lubricants. Estimated amount for fiscal year 1948 was \$35,124,000. The committee reduced this amount by five million.

It seems that several methods are used by the Army in the purchase of gasoline. In the interior zone—for posts, camps, and stations—the Treasury Department procures on sealed bids and open-end contracts. Then each post is given so much money, after which it is paid to a local contractor who hauls the gas. The methods of overseas purchases are to buy the gasoline and oil here and ship overseas; and from the Navy. There is a joint supply system with the Navy in overseas theaters.

Of this item requested by the War Department about 15,000,000 gallons of oil are used annually. The tax on these purchases amounts to about \$900,000, which flows from the War Department to the Treasury Department.

#### CLOTHING AND EQUIPAGE

On pages 292-294 of the hearings inclusive the testimony refers to the strength of Army and industrial mobilization. The 1948 estimated strength of the Army is 1,070,000. That means effectives and ineffectives. Ineffectives are those in hospitals, on terminal leave and so forth.

As to clothing and equipage one of the witnesses, General Middleswart, testified that the Quartermaster Service is going to get together with industry and determine where they will place the contracts. This scheme was used prior to the war when the Army actually placed tentative agreements with specific factories to purchase shoes, or clothing, or whatever else was contemplated in this line. It is their purpose to buy their requirements for the first year for 5,000,000 shoes from these factories and work in a specific manner, and beyond that they will go back into raw materials, and say this shoe program requires so many nails, thread and so forth. In other words, it is their position to work out a complete industrial plan. Better materials and more economy should be in the offing under this plan.

The committee in dealing with the estimated cost of \$27,056,561 by the Army

for clothing and equipage took into consideration a general increase in price of textiles, and clothing items. We reduced their estimates by \$3,383,000.

Pages 361-364, inclusive, of the hearings deal almost exclusively with the proposed removal of research and development of the Quartermaster Service from Philadelphia to Boston. If the plans for a laboratory some 400 miles from the present site at Philadelphia are entertained then the taxpayers have an additional burden to think about. The testimony on the pages to which I have made reference does not in any particular show that it is in the interests of our National Defense and our economy to have the proposed laboratory in the East other than Philadelphia. Materials, equipment, colleges of great learning, and personnel are present in or easily accessible to Philadelphia, all of which are the means whereby the Quartermaster Service can and will make progress in their research and development by remaining where presently situated. The testimony before our committee on this subject clearly shows that a little more candor is the procedure for General Middleswart to follow if and when this subject is again approached and developed.

Taking into consideration all the facts and circumstances surrounding the hearings on the Quartermaster Service phase of appropriations on Military Establishment, it is my judgment that the committee has been careful and fair; careful of protecting our national defense in accord with the evidence presented to us by the mighty fine and conscientious high Army officials that testified before us. I have nothing but the highest praise for their alertness and their willingness to cooperate with us. And fair, with the American people who look to us to represent their interests according to the American way of doing things.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, at the outset may I say to the gentleman from Texas who just questioned Mr. MAHON about the committee activities that there was never any question in the mind of any member of the committee as to the attitude, the honest effort and endeavor, and the undying loyalty of every member of that committee as they pursued this particular problem. The Nation's future was our paramount thought; economy was secondary.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I am getting somewhat sick and tired of the suggestion that somebody told your committee that there must be a certain percentage of cut made. Did you ever hear that?

Mr. SCRIVNER. No; I never heard that from the chairman of the subcommittee or the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations or any other Member of the House. Every man on this committee served diligently and according to the dictates of his conscience. As far as General Richards is concerned,

I do not know him as well perhaps as the gentleman from Texas, but I will make this observation that any time you got information out of him you had to drag it out of him. I can show you in the hearings where the committee made requests for various pieces of information, and as far as I can find out, they still are not there. One particular report related to the President's stop-spend order and its effect on the Army. It is still not forthcoming. Perhaps by the time I get to know the general as well as the other gentlemen of the committee I will have as high a regard for him as they have. These hearings have been difficult and tedious. I wish some of those same gentlemen who have talked about the need for funds for the Army had been able to prevail upon the President that their position was right. If you will look over the report, you will find one thing that was cut by the President's freeze order was aviation and research. It seems more than passing strange that when a committee of Congress honestly and conscientiously scrutinizes the entire situation and tries to make some minor saving that a howl goes up to high heaven when we cut a few million dollars, whereas when the President does it there is nothing said, even when his cut is more drastic than the one proposed by the House. Read the hearings and learn what some of these men said when they appeared before us; how the President's cuts affected the plane program.

Where the gentleman from Texas gets this cut from 932 down to 700 planes is something that I cannot find out. I have read every page of the hearings, and I cannot find it.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. I got that from a letter from the Secretary of War which I hope to place in my remarks.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I certainly have not seen any such letter from the Secretary of War.

Mr. MAHON. I also get that from the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], chairman of our subcommittee, who, in the full committee, as you may remember, said that the funds requested, even if they were all granted, would probably provide for no more than about 600 airplanes. The gentleman has asked for information. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield briefly to the gentleman. I was astonished to hear you make that statement because I have never seen the letter from the Secretary of War. If the gentleman has one, I think the other members should also have received a copy. If you look at the hearings on page 654 you will read the testimony of the War Department's own representatives.

I am not an aviation expert. I do not know about the cost of planes. But General Powers, who is supposed to be the authority so far as the Air Corps is concerned, said that \$281,000,000 is for the procurement of 932 new airplanes. The total sum of \$440,000,000 is not for the

procurement of new plants, and everybody knows that. Not only that, but the newest type which the gentleman mentioned—your jet-propelled planes and supersonics which come as a result of research and development—is not in new procurement at all. They come from research money. And yet it was the taking of \$75,000,000 out of research and development, General LeMay said, was the straw that broke the camel's back.

I am concerned about these things too. I have been for more years than I can remember. As a matter of fact, when I came to the House almost half of my adult life had been in or closely related to the military. It was almost a religion with me. It still is. I have advocated the two-ocean Navy, an Air Force second to none, and an Army of a million men, for almost a quarter of a century. It is not just a line with me. I believed it. I have lived it. I have breathed it. My greatest regret was that when this war came, a service-connected disability prevented me from service.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I do not impugn the gentleman's sincerity or honesty or motive or desire to give this Nation what the Nation is entitled to in the way of an Air Force, but as a matter of fact, a reduction of \$44,000,000 will give us less than 600 new airplanes. I am sure the gentleman, when he carefully investigates the matter, will find that that is the case.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I appreciate those words of approbation. However, there has been some suggestion that perhaps some other considerations entered into this; but here is what I am trying to get at. You talk about \$44,000,000. After all these figures the chairman has given you, go back to what General Powers said in the hearings. He said this: "The \$281,000,000 calls for 932 planes."

He did say that maybe this price per pound might be low—and that is the way they figure them—in other words, you build bigger planes and you get a fewer number; you build the smaller planes and you get more in number; but these are his figures. I have not seen anything yet to change the whole picture one single bit. They are his figures. They presented them—and ample time elapsed for them to submit any necessary changes.

Remember, as you sit here discussing this you are trying, as these men tried and we tried, to project yourselves into the future, not only 3 months or 6 months but a year or 2 years or 5 years, and if anyone can tell me what the costs are going to be then, he has certainly got a big job waiting for him, because there are a lot of questions I and many others would like to ask him.

Coming back to the new planes, look on page 13 and see what General Rawlings said about the \$30,000,000 reduction in new aircraft production, because of the President's cut. Where the President gets the authority for such action I do not know. I am trying to get an answer to that question, where he can superimpose upon the Army and the Congress his opinions. Where he got his in-

formation as to the airplane program, which disagrees with the gentleman from Texas I just do not know. But I cannot help thinking how terrible some people think it is for us to do anything like this but when the President does it, it is perfectly all right. If he can do it I do not know why it is so terrifically outlandish for us to do it ourselves.

There was comment made about there being nothing in the report about aviation and the number of planes. I was not consulted, but right now in the bottom of my heart I think one of the things that causes much trouble is that we Americans like to brag too much. We like to tell what we are going to do and what we have. We would be far better off if we said less about it and then started doing it and let accomplished facts speak for themselves. The question was asked a while ago, What do we know about what is going on behind the iron curtain and how many of their agents are over here? Well, they do not have to have very many. All they need is one or two who can sit down and read the newspapers. They can find out with the greatest ease just exactly what we are doing every day in the year, from the latest bomber down to the Banshee, which is supposed to be the last thing in plane production. When it was presented to us it was absolutely hush hush. You could not talk about this at all. Yet before the hearings are over, before the bill has been passed, you have it on the pages of the newspapers and anybody who can read can find out with the greatest of ease just exactly what we have.

I want to join, too, in the tribute to the ability, the energy, the honesty, the integrity, and the loyalty of the chairman of this committee. That goes for the rest of them. In these few short weeks in which I have worked with this committee, I have come to know and respect and admire every member of the committee.

That includes not only Republicans like HARVEY TIBBOTT, CASE, and ENGEL, but Democrats like Judge KERR, MAHON, and NORRELL, who has not been able to be with us as much as we would like to have had him.

The committee instead of being scolded, as it has been, should be commended on having done an exceptionally fine job under exceedingly difficult circumstances. This experience on this committee convinces me that one thing in the reorganization bill has great merit, and I hope we have an opportunity to exercise it before the hearings are over next year; that is, to give each of these committees a staff and corps of capable investigators who can go out and find out things that we of the committee do not have the opportunity to. If you sit there in these committees as we have you see generals in charge of each one of these operations of the War Department flanked and buttressed on each side with innumerable aides and experts ranking from generals down. Whenever any one of them needed any information at all he turned to one side or the other or to the rear and asked Jones, Smith, or Brown what the answer was. We had no one to whom we could turn. The committee needs that kind of

help, and certain it is that if all of these hundreds can be provided for the other agencies of the Government, then these committees can be given a few men and it will be money very well spent.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. I desire to compliment the gentleman for the fine presentation he is making. I recall in particular the statement he just made regarding the publicity which was given in respect to what we are doing, the type of planes we are perfecting, the nature, the amount, and character. Do we get any such information from Russia so that we know just what she is doing at this particular time?

Mr. SCRIVNER. As far as I know we get no information of any kind from Russia that is reliable, or from many other parts of the world. As a matter of fact I will go even further, we are making it even easier than I stated before because the Army periodically gets out these summary sheets so that they do not even have to read the daily papers to know what we are doing in the field of aviation, they can just pick up this outline.

I spoke of the men who appear before our committee. I have known some of these men for many many years, fine gentlemen every one of them. Sometimes I feel just a little sorry for them; I think they would like to have been more helpful, yet they were faced with a limitation. The President—and you will find the letter on page 631—told them in substance that they could do nothing else but support the figures in the President's budget, and he said "only." This is not Webster's definition of "only" but the only definition I know of the word "only" is "nothing else but." That does not say "higher than" or "lower than" but "only those figures." And yet these men with all the help they have are not infallible. No human being is infallible. I want to call your attention to one situation in connection with the budget and the justifications. The work of preparing this budget began last May, June, July, and August, just as they are now working on the 1949 budget; but even so, when this budget came to us the justification for pay and allowances of officers bore the date of January 20, 1947—whether you were in the service in World War I, in peacetime, or in World War II—I do not think you have to have a great deal of explanation to understand just how absurd some of the figures were that were given to this committee. For instance, here is what we find in Pay and Allowances for other than air forces: 4,023 second lieutenants, 6,719 first lieutenants, 21,177 captains, 20,706 majors, 12,637 lieutenant-colonels and 6,000 colonels.

Ask any soldier, ask any man who was in the Navy how ridiculous that distribution is. Of course, they came in and at a later date made a change and said, as my recollection is, that they were going to have 11,000 second lieutenants, 16,000 first lieutenants, and 21,000 captains, that they were going to cut down the majors, the lieutenant-colonels, and the colonels.



Mr. SPRINGER. Of course, that distribution is out of step with their needs.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes. Finally they admitted that was out of step and that it was top heavy and undertook to submit the new table.

There were other things. I can understand the difficulty with which they labored and I hope, too, that the House, this committee and those officers can understand some of the difficulties under which we have to labor at times.

Mr. SPRINGER. Another question, and referring back to the investigations that have been made. We have had a large number of people traveling through Europe, especially in Russia. May I ask the gentleman to state if it is not a fact that of all the inquiry that has been made we have been unable to secure any definite or positive information with regard to what Russia is doing with reference to preparation for war?

Mr. SCRIVNER. As far as any inquiry is concerned we know practically nothing. There was one report that during the May Day celebration in Moscow on the 1st of May two or three planes which were possibly B-29's did fly over the parade. They may have been some of the B-29's which were interned by Russia when the crews had to land in Russia.

Inasmuch as General Richards has been mentioned I want to refer to one comment he made, and I think it was properly made. He said that we can always do without our cake. When you analyze this whole bill about all we have done is to take a little bit of cake away from our military forces. Whether or not more appropriation would do more good. I do not know. You have been shown that the President limited the amount that the Army could spend in 1947. He has also limited the amount which can be spent by the Army in 1948. That amount by Presidential order is \$6,700,000,000. He says that is all the Army can spend in fiscal 1948. If that is so, it stands to reason we could probably appropriate many, many billions, and still it might not have a very salutary effect as far as the Army's procurement program is concerned, in view of the limit fixed by the President.

We tried as best we could in our limited way to find the facts. Many things, as I say, puzzled us. Remember this budget was in preparation in May, June, July and August of last year. We found, for instance, that as late as February 1946, only 5 or 6 months earlier, the War Department had declared as surplus 1,577,856 gallon blitz cans. You will also see in hearings that the top price received for blitz cans at surplus sale was 55 cents per can.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The Army is now asking to buy 703,000 of these cans at \$4.40. You will find that on page 324 of the hearings. It gives the whole story. So, as I say, they are prone to err just the same as the rest of us.

One thing that has been mentioned but not thoroughly discussed is the matter of the National Guard. If you read the hearings you will find a statement by

Secretary Patterson in which he evaluates the National Guard. You will also find a statement there by General Eisenhower in which he praises the service of the National Guard most highly. But some place between the Secretary and General Eisenhower there seems to come a little barricade so that those good wishes and good feelings do not trickle down. A reading of the hearings will disclose statements made by the representatives of the National Guard from various States relating to the treatment that is now being accorded them as relates to equipment, and particularly as to uniforms. It is a tragic story. There has been complaint that the National Guard has not proceeded as rapidly as possible. Of course not, but as far back as last September the President took away from them \$65,000,000 of the \$110,000,000 that Congress said they should have to carry on the program.

The Reserve, too, is having some difficulty. There, too, the President took away \$30,000,000 from the Reserve activities, and you will see in this bill that this committee—and I feel quite sure the House will go along with us on that whole thing—has given the National Guard and the Reserve the full amount of the suggested appropriations to give these civilian groups a chance to do their stuff.

For years we have talked about the necessity for an Army of a million men. Incidentally, if we had had such an Army in 1917 and in 1939, we might not have been in either one of these two great wars. But, we have talked about it. It probably cannot be a Regular Army of that size, because this is not the type of a Nation that anticipates a Regular Army that large, but we do anticipate that the great bulk, 50 to 60 percent, will be from civilian components with your National Guard as a part of your D-day program, ready to go whenever the emergency arises. They should be and must be prepared, and while we questioned many of the witnesses quite thoroughly as to the prospects for any immediate emergency arising, there seems to be no feeling of fear on the part of any of them that there is anything of that sort in the immediate offing. But, it might develop, and I think the public might as well realize that as the years go by, 2, 3, or 4 years hence, particularly as it relates to air, as more and more of these planes are worn out, the more we must appropriate to keep the air force up and that, I am sure, Congress will do.

I could go on and discuss many of these things, but you will find them all in the hearings. Take, for instance, the type of uniform. Even though \$27,000,000 was in the hands of the quartermaster for uniforms for the National Guard, they were issued second-rate uniforms that the men were ashamed to put on and wear home. Any man that has ever been in any kind of military service knows that the first step toward making a good soldier or sailor is pride in himself and pride in his uniform, and when that pride is not there neither is the morale. When that man has to walk home through a back alley because he is ashamed to meet his friends, you are not going to have any morale, and all of your vast recruiting campaigns, spending millions upon

millions of dollars, will never develop morale so that you will ever have a reserve force of civilian components that will be worthy of the word.

In these hearings you will find the report of the Judge Advocate General as to the effect of the Tort Claims Act as carried in the reorganization bill. I am not going into it in detail, but by reading that report—and I am sure their statements will be later supplemented—you will find that one of the most advisable things this Congress can do before it adjourns is to repeal that Tort Claims Act and restore the practice we have had in times past of equitably satisfying claims against the Government through your claims committee, and not through the tort actions in the courts.

Mr. Chairman, I have spoken longer than I had intended, and I close with this comment. I have made it in committee and I have made it out of committee. If I felt down in my heart that this reduction of approximately 10 percent in the aviation procurement program—in view of the fact that we have not decreased research and development, which is the building of brand-new and experimental models, and in view of the fact that there is \$280,000,000 contract authorization over and above that of last year even with this decrease down to the budget figure of last year—if I thought for just 1 minute that that decrease would endanger the welfare and the future of this Nation in even the slightest degree, I would not hesitate to vote to restore the figure. If the gentleman from Texas has any other figures, even though the figures have not been presented to the committee—and I think, in all fairness, they should have been—I would like to study them. I have an open mind. I am open to conviction, if the gentleman from Texas can convince me this Nation's future is endangered by this reduction.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, may I say in starting that I do not impugn the motives of any member of the committee or, for that matter, Members of Congress at this hour. I have known the members of this subcommittee for many years, and I know them to be good, hard-working, conscientious men, eager and desirous of doing their duty by the country. Anybody who has obtained a copy of these hearings and gone through them in even a cursory manner is bound to realize that this committee spent many painstaking, long, weary hours in attempting to get to the bottom of the needed appropriations. On the contrary, rather than attempt to impugn the motives of anyone who has had anything to do with this bill, I have praise for the committee's work on it in presenting us a bill. But that does not mean, Mr. Chairman, that I am hog-tied to every figure and every appropriation in the bill. On the contrary, the Appropriations Committee has a monopoly of the appropriations in the House. You cannot get an appropriation of any sort unless you go to that committee. In all deference to the members of the committee, and recognizing their ability,

their courage, and their leadership, I still at times differ with them on appropriations and sometimes fundamental figures in a bill. I think today that is the situation with reference to the figures on the Air Force. I am going to use the time allotted to me today in analyzing some of the figures in this bill in special reference to the Air Force.

Mr. Chairman, the comparative statement in the committee report is composed of huge items. It is difficult, to say the least, to get behind these items in an effort to find out just where the reductions in expenditures will cut heavily upon the War Department. It is apparent, however, that the expenditures for last year were \$1,199,500,000 as against appropriations in the current bill of \$733,332,508. It is apparent that the current appropriations as contained in this bill are \$116,000,000 below Budget estimates and far below last year's expenditures. The report does not disclose just how this figure was arrived at; and I have given considerable thought and study in an effort to work out the figures and to apply the cuts where this committee evidently intended that they should be applied.

Mr. Chairman, I want to comment on certain items in this appropriations bill and, for the present at least, I want to confine my remarks to the Army Air Forces. To my mind, the needs of the Air Forces are particularly urgent. It is upon this branch of the service that we must rely for the repulse of a sudden and surprise attack from the enemy, in the event of another war. It is this branch of the service upon which the burden of the first blow will fall; and it is upon this branch of the service we must continue to depend until the country has had the opportunity to mobilize for war. It is therefore particularly important that needed moneys for these purposes shall be given without crippling economies and arbitrary reductions.

The appropriations for civilian personnel of the Air Forces have been drastically cut. This reduction will eliminate 17,573 employees who are now engaged largely in supplying the logistical support essential to air operations. This reduction will have a particularly damaging effect in the continuity of Headquarters, Army Air Forces, where strategical planning, mobilization plans and operational controls are carried on. Failure to replace these cuts will have a marked effect in undermining an already weakened Air Force.

Another item which concerns me very much is the reduction of \$10,000,000 for fuel and oil for airplanes. This reduction will result, of course, in less training and less flying in the combat flights and problems. Required flying hours are necessary to keep our Air Forces in readiness as an effective combat force to meet an instant emergency.

The cut in the item for transportation is also very heavy. It will make it necessary to completely eliminate all commercial air lift now being furnished under contract by commercial carriers. The Air Transport Command will not have sufficient strength to supply the total overseas air lift required to maintain occupation garrisons in 1948. It is

estimated that 50 percent of the present air lift to the Pacific theater will have to be eliminated, thereby further isolating our already isolated forces from their homeland.

The reduction of \$44,000,000 in funds necessary for the purchase of new airplanes is something to consider in the long-range plans of the Air Forces. Initially, the Air Forces estimated that it needed 932 airplanes as the irreducible minimum for the proper maintenance and operation of its 55 manned combat groups. The cost estimates were drawn up last September 1946 and were based upon figures available and considered accurate at that time. By the time the requirements had run the gamut of the Department and the Budget and were submitted to the Appropriations Committee, the costs of building airplanes had risen to the point where funds requested would purchase only 838 airplanes instead of the minimum estimated as needed—932 airplanes. By the time the committee had reported, prices had increased further and the committee had taken \$44,000,000 from Budget requirements. This means, therefore, fewer airplanes for the Army Air Forces. It means, in fact, less than 600 new planes and spare parts as against the original estimate of 932 with the \$396,000,000 recommended by the Appropriations Committee. This reduction will be further aggravated by the serious situation existing in the airplane industry caused by lack of production orders. It will be further aggravated by the confusion and the lack of war-time efficiency in industry caused by the release of skilled workers and the breaking up of most efficient work teams. The outlook is, therefore, certainly not pleasing from the standpoint of national defense.

One of the other reductions which is most difficult to explain is the cut of \$9,500,000 from which it was intended that electronic equipment be purchased. This cut will undoubtedly reduce the scope and delay the completion of proposed radar protective screen for the continental United States. This screen is considered vital for giving adequate warning of the approach of hostile aircraft or guided missiles, and it is deemed highly essential to the security of the entire country. You will recall that the radar screen had not been completed for Hawaii at the time of Pearl Harbor; and it has been warmly debated whether or not there would have been a Pearl Harbor had this work been completed at the time of the dastardly Jap attack. The amount of this appropriation is not large; but its importance to our people could easily be measured in the difference between success and failure, victory and defeat.

Mr. Chairman, the Army Air Forces have a mission which is closely akin to the destiny of this country. I do not think that the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Military Training added one whit when it referred to the mission of the Air Forces as follows:

A striking air force: Spearhead of our professional armed services, this force would be charged with the crucial mission of defense by attack. Its job would be to stop the

enemy's first onslaught and to hit back at him with crushing force. We believe that an aggressor's reluctance to start a war, and his handicap in prosecuting it successfully if he did start, would be in direct proportion to the power and readiness of our mobile striking force. Its personnel would have to be highly trained and its equipment would have to be the most advanced in the world.

The statement of the President's Advisory Commission as given above is entirely in harmony with the estimate which the Air Forces themselves place upon the immediate and primary task of this great organization. According to their own statements, the two immediate tasks are:

(a) To provide a long-range striking force in instant readiness and with the power and capacity to destroy the storehouse of enemy weapons and thereafter to reduce the enemy's industrial capacity and war-making potential.

(b) To provide in peacetime the minimum establishment for prompt and rapid expansion from peace to war.

Mr. Chairman, I agree fully with the estimate which has been made of the mission of our Army Air Forces. I frankly feel the reductions in appropriations made by this bill will impair and hurt the Air Forces to the extent that they cannot fulfill these two primary missions. I frankly feel that these heavy reductions in our Air Forces will reduce them to a state of impotence and inability to measure up to their full usefulness in the face of a sudden and surprise enemy attack. Those who urge these reductions in appropriations of our Air Forces assume a tremendous burden of responsibility should their insistence on these cuts bring about a reduction in the state of efficiency and power of the Air Forces. I certainly hope that this House will pause before it is too late and, in the light of the vital responsibility which falls upon the Army Air Forces in defending this country from sudden attack, restore the funds taken from the bill by these drastic reductions.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I think the reduction of \$44,000,000 which reduces the number of new planes to be purchased and the number of parts needed to condition and maintain the airplanes presently in use, is vital. I feel that the time that has been given to this in debate on the floor is justified by the seriousness of the reduction of this appropriation. I hope the House will consider this long and well, and when it comes to a vote, with committee acceptance, we will be able to place back in the bill that item of some \$40,000,000, the \$9,500,000 for the radar defense of the Nation and the other items mentioned by me.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

RFC WITH AID OF LOCAL BANKS PERFORMING WONDERFUL SERVICE FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is important that Members of Congress realize the importance of the activities of the RFC in view of the fact that the Corporation's powers expire June 30 if not extended.



**SMALL BUSINESS PRIORITY UNDER SECTION 18 (e) OF THE SURPLUS PROPERTY ACT AS FUNCTIONED BY RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION**

Pursuant to Executive order, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, on January 28, 1946, was made responsible for functioning the priority given small business under section 18 (e) of the Surplus Property Act. From that date until April 30, 1947, the Corporation received 82,131 inquiries for assistance in the acquisition of surplus property which resulted in its purchasing for small business \$48,062,838 worth of such property. The Corporation discontinued this function by reason of a ruling by the Comptroller General.

**TECHNICAL AND BUSINESS ADVISORY SERVICES AVAILABLE TO SMALL BUSINESS**

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation's assistance to small business has not been limited to the making of loans or the securing of surplus property. For the 11-month period ended April 30, 1947, the Corporation received approximately 260,000 requests for assistance from business enterprises, of which 142,000, more than half, did not request loans nor surplus property assistance. Applicants requested the advice and counsel of the Corporation's trained staff in connection with a wide range of problems, including management, engineering, accounting, and financial. Small businesses seldom have among their personnel trained experts covering such a wide variety of problems but which nonetheless are often vital to successful operations. By using its trained personnel, the Corporation is often able to render valuable services to small businesses in the solution of their problems in locating an applicant's difficulties, suggesting various possible solutions, and indicating private sources from which expert technical and consulting assistance can be secured as may be needed for detailed application.

It frequently occurs that, after preliminary discussion, an applicant for a loan becomes convinced that the solution of his problem does not lie in securing a loan in the amount, kind, term, or for the purposes sought.

The following brief histories of actual cases are illustrative of what can be accomplished through these services:

A bank had been approached by a borrower seeking a loan, the proceeds of which were to be used in the construction of an alfalfa dehydration plant. The president of the bank called upon the local RFC office requesting advice and information concerning such a plant. It so happened that the local RFC office had considerable experience in this particular field, and those of the staff familiar with such an operation discussed in detail with the banker the many difficult problems surrounding such a plant, as well as production costs, profit possibilities, and prospects for present and future markets. A few days later, the banker called the local RFC office, expressed his appreciation, and reported that the promoters as well as the bank had abandoned the idea of seeking a loan for such a purpose.

A veteran, while discussing the possibilities of an RFC loan with which to purchase a truck, happened to indicate the trouble he was having in producing

magnetic tack hammers at a cost which would permit their sale at a profit. Certain simple changes in design were suggested by an RFC engineer, who also indicated a probable better source of supply of castings necessary for the hammers. The suggestions were carried out with the result that the business was re-established on a profitable basis.

The principal officer of a research laboratory, a veteran of World War II, called at his local RFC office requesting assistance in connection with certain difficulties he was having in manufacturing a small gas engine for use in flying model airplanes. He reported that his company had suffered a substantial loss resulting primarily from this difficulty. An RFC engineer considered his problem and suggested certain changes in the manufacturing process for one of the parts in the engine and recommended that he secure the services of an experienced designing engineer until the process could be corrected. The RFC engineer's recommendation was followed with the result that the difficulty was eliminated and the company operated profitably.

**CASE HISTORIES ILLUSTRATIVE OF RFC LOAN ACTIVITIES IN CONNECTION WITH SMALL BUSINESS—RFC MAKES LOAN AFTER BANK DECLINES**

The following is a typical illustration of how a direct loan by the RFC assisted in the creation of a successful small business after credit had been refused by banks: A native of an eastern State desired to establish a wool-combing plant in a Southwestern State. After a thorough survey a location was selected in a small town located in a wool-producing area in that State. The business was established in 1941 through the investment by the owner of a small amount of money in a minimum of necessary equipment. After a few months' operations, it became apparent that two additional pieces of machinery were necessary in order to meet the growing demand for washing, scouring, and combing wool. The owner applied to his bank of account for a loan of \$7,500 for that purpose. The bank declined to make the loan. The local office of RFC was then contacted, an application filed, and loan granted. Subsequently additional loans were granted for further plant expansion. Today the plant is enjoying successful operations with a total value of facilities estimated at \$400,000 and affords substantial employment to the community in which it is located.

**BANK MAKES LOAN AFTER RFC INVESTIGATION INDICATES SOUNDNESS**

In mid 1946 an applicant in a Southern State contacted the local RFC office and discussed plans for the organization and installation of a canning plant. Applicant, at RFC examiner's suggestion, discussed the possibilities of securing a loan from his local bank, which declined to make the loan. Further discussions between the applicant, RFC examiner and the local bank were conducted with the result that local financing was arranged without RFC assistance. The plant was opened and operated successfully and is serving an economic need in the small community in which it is located.

**BANK PARTICIPATES WITH RFC AFTER FIRST DECLINING LOAN**

A manufacturing plant located in a small community in a Southern State, with approximately 250 employees, was unable to meet its weekly pay roll of about \$17,000. The day before the pay roll was to have been met the situation was called to the attention of the RFC office serving that territory. Within an hour after notice had reached the office an RFC examiner was on his way to the plant. Banks were contacted, refusing to make the loan for pay-roll purposes but after negotiations running well into the evening the banks made a loan in participation with the RFC and the pay roll was met the next day and the business saved. The loan was subsequently repaid in full.

**GI GIRLS START HOSPITAL WITH RFC ASSISTANCE**

Early in 1946 two GI girls were referred to the RFC by a bank located in a small town in a Western State. The girls wished a loan for the purpose of purchasing real property for the establishment of a hospital badly needed in that community. The loan was granted and, with the assistance of the RFC staff, property was secured, irregularities in titles were corrected, and the hospital opened and is being operated successfully. It has the complete backing of the community and is the only hospital there.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to say that in the time I have served in Congress I have supported all the appropriation measures which have been before the House to strengthen and keep strong our Nation. It pleases me to be able to say that I was not one of those Members who waited until after Pearl Harbor to support the legislation to strengthen and keep strong our country. We have sustained great loss of life and costly delays by not remaining strong at times in the past. Surely we should have learned our lesson in the past and should never again take a chance insofar as the strength of our country is concerned.

I say we should not weaken the influence of our Nation, particularly in a serious time like this, by weakening our Army or our Navy.

Although I recognize there has been some waste, great emphasis should be placed on the representations of those on whose shoulders rests the responsibility of being as sure as we can be that our country's welfare is secure and properly protected.

A few minutes ago I heard my able and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], a member of the subcommittee which brought in the bill now before the House, discuss the provisions of the bill; I feel he is correct in what he says about the reductions which have been made in the funds of the Army Air Force. It is my purpose to support his amendment to provide additional funds for this division of the War Department.

As a member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the committee which deals with civil aviation

legislation, I personally feel civil aviation will gain much as a result of any progress and advancements made by our Army Air Force. Once we permit our Army and Navy to become weak we find the task of rebuilding them to be much more difficult. We have experienced this in the past. To be definitely sure that our Army and Navy will be strong tomorrow, we must be sure we have done those things necessary to keep them strong today. I strongly favor keeping both strong today.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ross].

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, the question of adequate national defense is the most important matter that will come before the Congress this session. Events preceding and subsequent to the termination of hostilities of World War II have forcibly projected the problem of adequate national defense and national security into the thinking of every citizen. Adequate national defense is paramount. It is a gigantic problem. It calls for the prompt integration of every factor and every part of our industrial potential. Adequate national defense means not alone the maintenance of sufficient military forces. It means the adoption of a well-defined program for the complete and timely mobilization of our civilian economy in the event of attack. Our war potential is only as strong as the moral fiber of our people and only as potent as our ability to quickly produce the instruments of war.

I was so impressed with the necessity and the urgency of this that on March 17 I introduced H. R. 2589, a bill to establish a Civilian Mobilization Commission. This bill would set up a Commission of 11 members: 7 to be appointed by the President, 1 of whom shall be chairman; 2 by the President pro tempore of the Senate and 2 by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, from the membership of their respective Houses.

Under the provisions of this bill, the Commission would not be a policy-making Commission, but rather a fact-finding Commission. I want to read section 1 of the bill and ask unanimous consent to insert the entire bill at this point, as part of the RECORD. Section 1 is as follows:

SECTION 1. *Be it enacted, etc.,* That (a) in the interest of world peace and the national security it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to insure the right of the United States of America to continue their present way of life and to assure their ability to withstand atomic or other form of attack by preparing for ready use and immediate execution a plan or plans for the complete mobilization of the civilian economy and for the complete protection of the agencies of Government.

(b) It is the purpose of this act to effectuate the policies set out in section 1 (a) by providing, among others, for the following major programs relating to complete civilian mobilization of industries, including protection of the civilian population and the agencies of Government:

- (1) A program of assisting and fostering a decentralization of essential industries;
- (2) A program of assisting and fostering protective plans for essential industries and the agencies of Government;

(3) A program of assisting and fostering a plan for the conversion of civilian industries to war production;

(4) A program of administration which will be consistent with the foregoing policies, and which will enable the Congress to be informed annually as to the appropriate legislation needed to carry into execution any of the foregoing plans or other related plans, none of which shall be put in execution until specifically authorized by law.

All of the leading military authorities recognize and are giving voice to the necessity and urgency of such a program. On May 28, 1947, more than 2 months after introduction of H. R. 2589, Gen. Brehon B. Somervell and Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, addressing the National Industrial Conference Board, came out in favor of a prewar planned program for industrial mobilization in the event of another war.

As reported in the New York Times, General Somervell stated that he was not predicting that war with Russia was inevitable, but was pointing out that it would be folly for us to ignore the fact that the United States would be a rich prize for an ambitious dictator. He said nobody knows whether a third world war would be a Buck Rogers affair using atomic bombs, bacteria rockets, and so forth, but that we would have to realize that dictators are ruthless realists and would have to prepare against the use of such weapons just as we prepared against the use of poison gas in the recent war.

According to the New York Times, General Somervell warned that industrial as well as manpower preparedness had lagged badly since VJ-day. He pointed out that we still lack even paper plans for industrial mobilization. He said:

Industry must be kept from year to year in the same state of semimobilization as our armed forces. In fact, the smaller our Army and Navy become, the greater degree of industrial mobilization we must maintain in time of peace.

To quote the New York Times, General Somervell stated:

The nucleus of civilian agencies to handle labor, civilian defense, civilian production, war materials, facilities, transportation, communication, power, war finance, foreign trade, and other aspects of the war economy must be in operation before the advent of war. The Nation could not afford . . . another long period of bungling and confusion during the next war, such as took place in the last war.

General Groves is quoted as saying that next time there will be no cushion of time, and, therefore, we must consider industrial mobilization a continuing process.

The report of the President's Commission on Universal Military Training, made public on June 1, in its program for a balanced security, stressed the need of a plan for industrial readiness. Point 4 of the program stated, and I quote:

Industrial mobilization: The development of new weapons will be of no value unless our scientific progress is matched by industrial readiness for the problems of war that may come without warning with supersonic speeds. Weapons that were not in being and in the possession of our troops when an ag-

gressor struck would be worthless in inflicting swift retribution upon him or in preventing his approach to our shores. Because of the danger that production centers would be demolished in the first days of war, a start should be made now toward decentralizing the most vital plants and, in some cases, toward building underground or otherwise adequately protected facilities.

Mr. Chairman, during this atomic age, with our country admittedly vulnerable to attack by atomic and projectile bombs and bacteriological vapors, it is absolutely essential that we have on tap for instant use plans for the immediate and total conversion of our civilian economy to a wartime economy. When World War III arrives we will not have time to fumble and bungle our production machine into high gear. We will not have time to experiment with plans for the protection of our civilian population. The need for plans to meet the kind of emergency that may be anticipated in the event of a sudden attack is unquestionable. With all the warning we had of the impending war in 1941, we were not prepared to proceed either defensively or offensively with any semblance of a concerted program. Agencies by the score were created hastily by Executive orders, directives, and so forth, many of them having overlapping or conflicting jurisdiction and duties. This made inevitable a constant reshuffling of agencies and functions, the absorption of some of the agencies by others, and the ultimate liquidation of those which, after considerable delay, were found to be unsuitable or ill-advised. This resulted in the loss of precious time, untold millions of dollars in waste, and inefficiency in our production machine.

In World War II we were fortunate in that we had time. In World War III it is a foregone conclusion that we will not have time. In my bill, H. R. 2589, the Civilian Mobilization Commission will be authorized to conduct continuous studies and assemble pertinent, up-to-date data on the whole question of our national-defense problem as it pertains to the civilian economy. Some phases of our civilian economy and some questions which, to my mind, the Commission will study and make the subject of recommendations to the Congress are:

First. Decentralization or concentration of particular industries in relation to national defense. Example: Whether to provide additional plant facilities or to scatter existing facilities.

Second. The most suitable methods of decentralizing such industries where decentralization is indicated.

Third. Whether particular industries should be sheltered from atomic attack by underground installations or otherwise.

Fourth. Camouflaging of essential industries against aerial observation.

Fifth. Providing for the safety of the agencies and records of the Federal Government in case of atomic attack, including plans for the rapid decentralization or removal of particular agencies of the Government.

Sixth. Means and methods of governing the actions of the civilian population and for providing for their safety.



The creation of the proposed Civilian Mobilization Commission would, as stated by General Somervell, insure efficiency and guard the American free enterprise system against excessive Government controls. H. R. 2589 provides that the plans and programs formulated by the Commission shall be submitted direct to the Congress, so that the needed legislation may be enacted without delay.

There is too much at stake to justify delegation of this problem to some branch or agency of the executive department. If there is to be another war, its outcome may well hinge upon our ability to swing into action at once and to utilize our industrial and economic resources with a minimum of delay. We, as the representatives of the people, have the primary responsibility in this matter. That responsibility must remain here. The commission or body that is entrusted with this vital task should at all times be responsible to the Congress and the Congress should see to it that the job is being done adequately, diligently, and continuously. We cannot risk unpreparedness again.

H. R. 2589

A bill to establish a Civilian Mobilization Commission, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That (a) in the interest of world peace and the national security it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to insure the right of the United States of America to continue their present way of life and to assure their ability to withstand atomic or other form of attack by preparing for ready use and immediate execution a plan or plans for the complete mobilization of the civilian economy and for the complete protection of the agencies of government.

(b) It is the purpose of this act to effectuate the policies set out in section 1 (a) by providing, among others, for the following major programs relating to complete civilian mobilization of industries, including protection of the civilian population and the agencies of government:

(1) A program of assisting and fostering a decentralization of essential industries;

(2) A program of assisting and fostering protective plans for essential industries and the agencies of government;

(3) A program of assisting and fostering a plan for the conversion of civilian industries to war production;

(4) A program of administration which will be consistent with the foregoing policies, and which will enable the Congress to be informed annually as to the appropriate legislation needed to carry into execution any of the foregoing plans or other related plans, none of which shall be put in execution until specifically authorized by law.

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby created a Civilian Mobilization Commission (hereinafter called the Commission) which shall be composed of 11 members, 7 appointed by the President (one of whom shall be Chairman) with the advice and consent of the Senate, 2 by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and 2 by the Speaker of the House from the membership of their respective Houses.

(b) Of the members of the Commission appointed by the President, two shall be appointed for a term of 2 years, two for a term of 4 years, two for a term of 6 years, and the Chairman for a term of 7 years, and at the expiration of each of said terms, the commissioners then appointed shall be appointed for a term of 7 years. Members appointed by the Speaker of the House and by the President pro tempore of the Senate shall serve until the end of the Congress in which they are appointed.

(c) Each member, except the Chairman and four members who are Members of the Congress, shall receive compensation at the rate of \$ per annum; and the Chairman shall receive compensation at the rate of \$ per annum.

(d) Any member of the Commission appointed by the President may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.

(e) Members appointed by the President shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as a member of the Commission.

SEC. 3. The principal office of the Commission shall be in the District of Columbia, but the Commission or any duly authorized representative may exercise any or all of its power in any place. The Commission shall hold such meetings and receive such reports as may be necessary to enable it to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 4. The Commission shall have authority to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Commission. Such officers and employees shall be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws and their compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that to the extent the Commission deems such action necessary to the discharge of its responsibility, personnel may be employed and their compensation be fixed without regard to such laws.

SEC. 5. The Commission is hereby authorized to utilize or employ (with the consent of the agency concerned) the services or personnel of any Government department or agencies, or the services or personnel of any State or local government, or voluntary or uncompensated services or personnel.

SEC. 6. The Commission is authorized to make such studies and investigations, obtain such information, and hold such hearings as the Commission may deem necessary or proper to assist it in exercising any authority provided in this act. For the purpose herein authorized the Commission may subpoena a person to appear and testify or to appear and produce documents, or both, may administer such oaths and affirmations, at any designated place. No person shall be excused from complying with any requirements under this subsection because of his privilege against self-incrimination, but the immunity provisions of the Compulsory Testimony Act of February 11, 1893 (U. S. C. 49; 46), shall apply with respect to any individual who specifically claims such privilege. Witnesses subpoenaed under this subsection shall be paid the same fees and mileage as are paid witnesses in the district courts of the United States.

SEC. 7. The Commission is authorized to establish advisory boards to advise and make recommendations with the Commission on legislation, policy, administration, research, and other matters.

SEC. 8. The Commission shall submit to the Congress, in January of each year, a report concerning the activities of the Commission. The Commission shall include in such report, and shall at such other times as it deems desirable submit to the Congress, such recommendations for additional legislation as the Commission deems necessary or desirable.

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this act.

SEC. 10. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of this act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 11. This act may be cited as the "Civilian Mobilization Act of 1947."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. LODGE. I want to congratulate the gentleman from New York upon his able presentation of this thesis and on the vision that he has shown in the manner in which he has developed his ideas. No more vital problem confronts the Nation, and I know that we must have a readily expandable industry in order to back up our wartime needs. I commend the gentleman for his splendid address.

Mr. ROSS. I want to thank very much the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut for his kind remarks.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. It seems to me the gentleman has presented a very interesting suggestion here which is deserving of grave consideration by the Congress. I commend him very highly on the great study he has given this problem, resulting in this bill, which displays such unusual foresight and preknowledge of what is likely to confront us in the days to come.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the very able and distinguished gentleman from New York for his kind comments.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I am obliged to the chairman of the subcommittee for giving me this time. I intend to speak on the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947. On tomorrow when the matter is considered, the time will be short and I, therefore, appreciate so much this opportunity for stating my views on the conference report.

I voted against H. R. 3020, and it is my present view that I must vote against the conference report on the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947. The subject is, however, bigger than the vote alone; for all of us know that labor-management peace will not be attained by this bill, but will rather depend on what men do under the law when enacted. This is no interim measure, either, for it is, and is well recognized to be, what the majority considers a basic change in domestic policy. Such a basic change, so early in the tenure of a new majority, certainly calls for awareness and analysis. This bill, I believe, creates the wrong pattern for labor-management relations; for, instead of putting them on an economic base, it puts them on a political base. For example, instead of seeking means by which the worker may produce more, through higher efficiency, and therefore earn more real wages, the bill takes a negative approach and is replete with prohibitions, limitations, and restrictions.

I favor labor legislation which would correct manifest abuses first, and inspire



public confidence; then we could consider drastic regulation if events showed it to be necessary. There are three immediate problems requiring legislation: First, avoidance of national paralysis due to strikes resulting from labor-management deadlocks; second, democracy in some labor unions; and, third, jurisdictional and wildcat strikes, and boycotts, not in aid of labor disputes.

The bill tries to do something to cope with these problems—a good deal of it badly—but it also does other things which nullify its effectiveness as a step in a process of the growth of labor-management responsibility, and make the bill a measure of repression.

Title II deals with national emergencies and provides for injunctions against strikes imperiling the national health or safety for a limited time of approximately 80 days and certain other interim proceedings, but that does not relieve us of the fear of national paralysis due to a strike. The provision for an enforced waiting period in such cases may not in itself be objectionable, but it must be joined with the power of seizure by the Government and the right to operate to the minimal extent required for the public health and safety if it is to mean anything to the public. Injunctions will not run trains or keep electricity going. This basic fear of national paralysis due to labor-management strife is at the root of repressive labor legislation, yet the rank and file of labor does not want any such power and would welcome a constructive solution which does not amount, however, to involuntary servitude.

The provisions of the bill which relate to democracy in labor unions are perhaps its best. I have always insisted that when labor unions become great they become public-service organizations and should be subject to the same responsibilities in the public interest. They should give nondiscriminatory service, and at reasonable rates. But this bill, while imposing some measures of union democracy, fails to provide for grievance machinery for union members with respect to their own unions and union leaders; and also strips unions of the ability to defend themselves against labor spies, internal antiunion agitators, and other active wreckers. For example, a labor union under this bill cannot discipline a member except for nonpayment of dues. A member may, therefore, be a labor spy; he may be preaching constantly against the union and trying to break it up from the inside; he may be a saboteur starting wildcat strikes, and yet the union is helpless to get him fired from the union shop. Paradoxically enough, he may be a proven disciple of Communist revolution who aims to overthrow the Government by force, yet unless he is a union officer the union cannot discipline him. Coupled with the provision in the bill imposing financial liability for wildcat strikes which can break a union, the union is at the mercy of such destructive forces.

Under the extremely wide definition of boycotts in the bill, unions cannot protect themselves against strikebreaking within the same industry. The bill provides that workers may not refuse to handle or work on any goods for the

purpose of forcing their employer to cease handling the goods of another producer; yet that other producer may be in the same line of business, his employees may be out on strike and he may be using the first establishment to work on his goods as a means of strikebreaking. This provision is not only bad, but summary power is vested in any regional attorney of the NLRB to get an immediate court injunction to restrain any such legitimate refusal to handle "hot goods," and the protection of the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act, for which labor fought for 50 years, is removed in such a case. This is not the kind of boycott which is contrary to the public interest, that other kind results from a misguided labor union's efforts to keep certain goods out of a market because the labor union fears the effect of new inventions or new methods. But while dealing with this legitimate abuse, the bill also has the effect of depriving labor of a right of self-preservation which has never been questioned before.

Supervisors are omitted from any protection under the bill—even when separately organized—though we know from industrial experience that they are in the main workers like all others and very numerous as indicated by the strike of foremen at the Ford Motor Co. Yet under this bill such employees may be at the mercy of labor spies, suffer from employer discrimination and employer coercion of all types—the whole tragic history of the labor movement in its "middle ages" may be repeated as to them, and their efforts to protect their own economic interests be defeated. They have become by this bill the "untouchables" of labor.

We are in grave danger now of going into an era of labor-management relations which will repeat almost exactly the bitter experience of American business with the New Deal. There had been excesses and unusual losses then in the stock market and in securities and real estate, due to inflated and unsound values, just as we found irresponsibility and exactions from the public in some labor-union circles more recently. Some regulation of securities and securities markets and of pyramided utility investments was obviously needed. So today some regulation of labor-management relations is needed. But let us see what happened then and is likely to happen now. In 1933 the New Deal thought it had a mandate to suspect every businessman, and especially every banker, as being crooked until proven innocent, just as we are now asked to suspect every labor union of indulging in tactics jeopardizing the economy and the public interest. And so in 1933, with the same mental attitude, there followed the sweeping regulation of business, banking, finance, and public-utility holding companies incorporated in the regulatory acts administered by the Securities and Exchange Commission. These acts almost froze the velocity of the United States economy for critical years and compelled us to finance with Government money at a time when enormous resources lay sterile in the hands of the public. These sweeping acts regulating business, as we now plan to regulate

labor, were largely responsible for forcing the United States economy into a slump and maintaining excessive unemployment from 1937 to 1939 which would have become a major economic disaster if the war in Europe, with its enormous demands on our production, had not broken out in September 1939. Let us not forget that under the Public Utility Holding Company Act, due to its first drastic impact, hundreds of millions of dollars of values in the hands of American investors were lost—in the hands of almost as many millions of investors as the millions of union members we are now affecting—until inflation and the administrative moderation which came from experience restored some of the value. But who benefitted from this come-back—the investors who had sold out at the bottom or who were exchanged out by reorganizations? Of course not. It was largely speculators who bought in at the bottom who reaped the increment.

The mistake of suddenly swinging the pendulum way over in the other direction is being made in this bill, for it is heavily weighted in favor of the employer. For example, to get a union shop under this bill it is not enough that a union be elected by a majority of workers to be their collective-bargaining agent, but another election must be held and another majority of all the workers—a tougher provision than for the election of Congressmen where only a plurality of those who vote is required—simultaneously, or very soon thereafter must be obtained in order to win the right to bargain for a union shop, specifically; and after a year, 30 percent of the employees can set in motion yet another election in which a 51 percent vote can rescind the union shop.

Or, to take another example, in the case of a threat of national strike in a critical industry the workers must vote particularly on the "final offer of settlement made by their employer as stated by him," before they may strike—not on the union's demands, or even on the findings of the President's impartial Board of Inquiry, as well, but on the employer's final offer—strangely reminiscent of an un-American one-ticket election.

The middle-of-the-road course to which I have set myself demands not only that I vote against this report, it demands also that I specify what I see to require correction in labor-management relations. This I have tried to do, in the firm conviction that laws are not solutions, and that good policies can create decent solutions in a democracy, despite bad laws.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. REDDEN].

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Chairman, several days ago news reports were carried in the press to the effect that a mob in Northampton County, N. C., had gone to the jail and forcibly removed a Negro man who was being detained on a charge of assault on a white woman.

The story goes that the Negro escaped from the mob and later surrendered to the Federal Bureau of Investigation who delivered him to State authorities.



Indictments have been issued against those in the mob and they will be tried according to the laws of North Carolina, and I am sure a just decision upon the evidence will be rendered. That is what every true North Carolinian stands for.

In yesterday morning's news reports from that State a story is carried to the effect that another Negro man in the same county has attempted rape of a white girl, a young bride of 2 weeks, and that the community is very much upset over what appears to be a crime wave of rape in that section. The story describes how "upward of a hundred men, many of them armed, fanned out over the countryside after the girl, a recent high-school graduate and a bride of 2 weeks, reported the alleged attack." Two Negroes were taken under custody by the sheriff and promptly carried to an undisclosed jail for safekeeping. It is certainly regrettable that these attacks continue. They fan the flames of mob violence which tends to bring dispute upon the good name of a great State.

The cry goes out that we need antilynching legislation. Members of the FBI are sent to investigate to determine if any civil rights of the assailant are violated. Peace officers of our State rise up as one in an effort to prevent the mob from executing its unlawful intentions.

It may be well to have some Federal antilynching legislation. If so, I shall certainly favor it, but I think it would also be well to have some Federal anti-rape legislation. I think also that these organizations and individuals which are so interested in protecting the criminal assailants who undertake to rape the white women of the South, should interest themselves in an organization that will promote good morals and stand for decency and respect. We need organizations and individuals who will not forget that the rights of women have been invaded, that they have been humiliated and embarrassed beyond expression and that a law has been violated in that respect. It seems to be the tendency of some groups to forget that a woman has been assaulted or raped; their whole cry is "Save the criminal from the mob." We need to save the woman from the criminal and a little teaching along that line may help to prevent mob violence.

There has been antilynching legislation offered in this House every session for many years, but I have not heard of anyone offering any law to aid in the prevention of these criminal attacks which are calculated to bring out the mobs. I welcome the day when this legislation comes before the House again, for I expect to attach some amendments that will send the FBI after the criminal in cases of this kind, as well as after the mob, and instead of allowing funds recovered by the estate of the criminal to enrich his next of kin, I expect to offer legislation that will allow the recovery to be paid to the estate of the woman attacked if she does not survive.

We need to let these criminals know, whether they be white or black, that they stand to gain nothing and that they shall be punished to the full extent of a just law, and in that way I believe we may discourage crime.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill to permit the Veterans' Administration to allot supplies of the new anti-tuberculosis drug for the treatment of ex-service men and women, with non-service-connected cases, who are patients in State, county, and municipal hospitals.

Present regulations do not allow the Veterans' Administration to send this expensive drug for treatment of veterans in hospitals which are not under Veterans' Administration jurisdiction. I have received complaints that officials in these outside hospitals are not giving their veteran patients this drug. Whether this policy is dictated by a desire to force them out of these hospitals and into facilities operated by the Veterans' Administration, or for some other obscure reason, I do not know. The fact is, such veterans are entitled to a share of such new treatment, and feel that they are being discriminated against.

The bill I propose will authorize the Veterans' Administration to send such reasonable supplies as are necessary to State, county, and municipal hospitals for the care of veterans who prefer to enter institutions which are near to their homes.

This bill does not interfere in the management or control of the hospitals described.

It merely provides that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall inspect such hospitals at such times as he may consider necessary in order to satisfy himself with the character of care and treatment being rendered to eligible veterans in said hospitals. When the supplies are made available by this legislation, it will be the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration to see that this drug is being administered to those veterans for whom it is recommended by the medical authorities of the non-veteran hospitals.

I am sure that all of us, in our desire to be of service to the sick veteran, will not resort to penny-pinching economies in this matter.

There was a defect in the original legislation which must be corrected.

In doing this, we shall make supplies of streptomycin available to all veterans suffering from tuberculosis, no matter whether they are being treated in facilities operated by the Veterans' Administration or in State, county, or municipal hospitals.

Our veterans are also citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read down to and including line 6, page 1, of the bill.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HALLECK, having assumed the Chair, Mr. MICHENER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had

under consideration the bill (H. R. 3678) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947

Mr. HARTLEY submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes.

#### MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. HERTER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 230, Rept. No. 511), which was referred to the House calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3678) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, all points of order against title II of said bill or any provisions contained therein are hereby waived.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks made in the Committee of the Whole and include certain tables and quotations.

Mr. DIRKSEN (at the request of Mr. CASE of South Dakota) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an analysis of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of air accidents.

Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole, and include a letter from the Secretary of War, some excerpts from the hearings, and other matter.

#### LEASING OF PROPERTY BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks and include certain information from the Veterans' Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] wanted certain information regarding leasing of property by General Bradley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and also certain information was requested by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] regarding leasing of property by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Earlier in the day when I tried to secure the passage of the bill S. 1135 it was objected to by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wilson], who did not seem to be sure that General Bradley had exhausted all the possibilities of securing federally owned space. I obtained certain information, and I should like to state the Administrator's policy in connection with the acquisition of administrative space for the Veterans' Administration. I am including in my remarks a statement showing the administrative space acquired and in use by the Veterans' Administration as of March 31, 1947:

It is the policy of the Veterans' Administration, before leasing space of any type, to contact the Public Buildings Administration, Post Office, and other Government Departments in an attempt to locate space which may be made available to the Veterans' Ad-

ministration. More than 4,500,000 square feet of leased space has been obtained through or by the Public Buildings Administration for the Veterans' Administration. Much of this space was vacated by other Government agencies, such as the War Department, the Navy Department, Office of Price Administration, etc. While this statement does not show the quantity, many leases have been obtained by direct transfer from the War, Navy, and other departments, and are included in the figures shown as leased by the Veterans' Administration. It will be noted also, from the attached statement, that there is in use by field offices of the Veterans' Administration over 5,000,000 square feet of Federally owned space, much of which was obtained through the Public Buildings Administration and the Post Office Department.

Every effort is made to obtain, from universities, States, and municipalities, space for contact offices and guidance centers, without cost to the Federal Government. Over 274,000 square feet of space has been obtained by that means.

EXHIBIT A.—Veterans' Administration—Summary of space acquired and rental costs,<sup>1</sup> as of Mar. 31, 1947

Branch area	Total space acquired (square feet)	Federal (square feet)	Donated (square feet)	VA lease (square feet)	PBA lease (square feet)	Rental		
						VA	PBA	Total
Boston, No. 1.....	832,901	111,946	6,475	271,993	442,547	\$351,287	\$138,529	\$489,816
New York, No. 2.....	1,828,623	287,530	22,439	358,894	1,159,760	561,223	115,135	676,358
Philadelphia, No. 3.....	1,577,792	646,113	25,381	652,167	254,131	536,996	155,439	692,435
Richmond, No. 4.....	1,118,499	455,678	13,479	360,328	289,014	392,603	77,023	469,626
Atlanta, No. 5.....	1,285,811	727,575	2,445	365,222	190,569	368,346	210,309	578,655
Columbus, No. 6.....	1,473,872	394,984	10,581	672,722	395,585	830,345	332,471	1,162,816
Chicago, No. 7.....	1,644,858	273,344	4,108	686,444	680,962	988,565	135,968	1,124,533
St. Paul, No. 8.....	1,087,454	824,277	8,065	238,883	16,229	278,354	13,803	292,157
St. Louis, No. 9.....	876,480	216,786	47,410	315,809	296,475	405,315	181,045	586,360
Dallas, No. 10.....	1,062,193	378,040	48,907	394,303	240,943	430,721	205,332	636,053
Seattle, No. 11.....	690,796	73,292	73,552	451,152	2,800	742,838	1,050	743,888
San Francisco, No. 12.....	1,293,545	414,480	8,469	391,274	479,322	311,604	190,308	501,912
Denver, No. 13.....	475,674	284,453	3,036	47,831	140,354	54,571	128,037	182,608
Total, branch areas.....	15,158,498	5,088,498	274,347	5,206,962	4,588,691	6,252,768	1,884,449	8,137,217
New York branch, central office.....	690,000				690,000		680,664	680,664
Central office, Washington, D. C.....	1,503,326	1,443,758		15,600	43,968	12,000	34,000	46,000
Grand total.....	17,351,824	6,532,256	274,347	5,222,562	5,322,659	6,264,768	2,599,113	8,863,881

<sup>1</sup> Exclusive of supply depots, domiciliary facilities, and hospitals, except hospital at Saratoga Springs, N. Y., which is leased.

<sup>2</sup> This rental covers 2,145,259 square feet only. Balance is occupied on a nonreimbursable basis.

Prepared by Real Estate Service, Veterans' Administration.

I hope this statement will be satisfactory to the gentleman from Indiana. I feel very sure that all he wanted to do was to make certain that the administrator of veterans' affairs had exhausted every possible means of securing space so that there would be no additional cost.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, I am very glad to yield to the gentleman. I know of his interest in the veterans.

Mr. PHILBIN. Does the gentleman propose to insert the data which she has just given in the RECORD?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, the table will be included.

Mr. PHILBIN. I am sure that the Members will be very much interested in having this report.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It seems advisable to extend the authority to General Bradley for one to make the 5-year leases because he can do it more economically now than if he waits until the time expires, and that is the necessity for immediate action. If General Bradley is not allowed to renew leases probably he will be obliged to vacate buildings almost at once.

Mr. PHILBIN. That would seem to be very sound practice. I want to thank the gentleman very much for preparing this data and submitting it for the benefit of the House.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman has always been helpful in veterans' matters and has been always very cooperative in other matters.

The report of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to accompany H. R. 3060 is as follows:

EXTENDING FOR 1 YEAR CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF SECTION 100 OF THE SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944, AS AMENDED, RELATING TO THE AUTHORITY OF THE ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS TO ENTER INTO LEASES FOR PERIODS NOT EXCEEDING 5 YEARS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3060) to extend for 1 year certain provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 5 years, having considered the same, report favorably thereon, without amendment, and recommend that the bill do pass.

#### EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

The bill was recommended by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in a letter addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, dated April 9, 1947, and was approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs until June 30, 1948, to enter into leases for periods of not to exceed 5 years. In making such leases the Administrator is exempted from the provisions of the Economy Act of 1932, as amended (47 Stat. 412, as amended by 47 Stat. 1517). This exemption will permit making a lease where the first year's rental exceeds 15 percent of the fair market value of the premises and will allow alterations in excess of 25 percent of the first year's rental.

Today's real-estate market is such that it is nearly impossible to determine the exact fair market value of any property from day to day, and the present scarcity of materials and labor plus increased cost of both in today's market require the exemption of the 250 percent limitation.

Two other statutes are included in the exemption for technical reasons. Section 3679 of the Revised Statutes prohibits the expenditure in any one fiscal year in excess of the amount appropriated for that year, and also prohibits the making of a contract for future payments in excess of the amount of appropriations. Section 3732 of the Revised Statutes prohibits entering into any contract unless there is an appropriation adequate to its fulfillment. Since the leases will be for periods of 5 years, it is probable that the sums needed will be appropriated annually for each year of the lease rather than for the entire period. It is necessary to exempt these two provisions in order to make a lease entered into under the authority of this bill binding upon the Government where the period is more than 1 year. The Veterans' Administration, under its decentralization program, has established 1,468 branch, regional, subregional, contact, and guidance offices which are quartered in 1,685 separate buildings occupying approximately 13,500,000 square feet of office space as compared with an anticipated 15,000,000 square feet of office space. It would have been impossible to acquire much of this space under the conditions existing in the real-estate market of the country during the fiscal year 1947 had it not been for the authority contained in Public Law 424 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, which was favorably reported by this committee, giving this authority to the Administrator up to and including June 30, 1947.

During the coming fiscal year it is the intent of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to consolidate many of these offices under one roof, and to carry out this program of consolidation successfully it will be necessary to extend this law for one more year.

It has been the policy of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to exercise the leasing authority granted him only in cases in which it has been determined that the exercise of such authority was necessary in the public interest. It is believed this policy will remain in effect if the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to negotiate such leases is continued for the fiscal year 1948. Without such authority it doubtless would have been necessary in many cases either to accept undesirable space or to resort to condemnation or purchase to acquire suitable space.

The committee feels that failure to continue the provisions of Public Law 424, Seventy-ninth Congress, for another year would seriously hamper the activities of the Veterans' Administration, particularly those relating to the installation of out-patient treatment clinics. It would probably result in an increase in the expenditure of public funds.



The report of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs recommending the bill follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, D. C., April 9, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is transmitted herewith draft of a bill to amend section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, with the request that the same be introduced and considered for enactment.

The purpose of the proposed bill is to extend for 1 year the provisions of the second paragraph of section 100 of the act, as added by Public Law 424, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved June 22, 1946, which authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into 5-year leases, notwithstanding the fact that appropriations are not presently available for the entire period and further to permit such leases to be made free from the restrictions of the so-called Economy Act of 1932 (47 Stat. 412) approved June 30, 1932, as amended (47 Stat. 1517), prohibiting entering into any lease where the annual rental rate, in cases of rentals above \$2,000 per annum, exceeds 15 percent of the fair market value of the premises at date of the lease, or where the amount of alterations, repairs, and improvements to be made at Government expense exceeds 25 percent of the first year's rental. These provisions of section 100, supra, expire June 30, 1947.

No substantial change in the rental market is presently anticipated and the Veterans' Administration will have the same difficulty in securing rental space during the fiscal year 1948 as required by special authorizations contained in the act of June 22, 1946.

The Veterans' Administration, under its decentralization program, has established 1,468 branch, regional, subregional, contact, and guidance offices. These field offices are quartered in 1,685 separate buildings and occupy approximately 13,500,000 square feet of office space as compared with an anticipated maximum requirement of approximately 15,000,000 square feet of space. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs would have been unable to acquire much of this space under the conditions which existed in the real-estate markets of this country during the fiscal year 1947 had it not been for the authority contained in section 100, supra.

During the coming fiscal year, in the interest of improved service for veterans and maximum economy of operation, many of these offices will be consolidated under one roof. The number that will be consolidated cannot be estimated with any degree of accuracy, but such consolidations will be made wherever practical. However, if the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is to successfully carry out this program of consolidation, it will be necessary for him to continue to exercise his present authority under section 100, supra.

The policy of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs during the fiscal year 1947 has been to exercise the leasing authority in question only in those instances in which it has been determined that the exercise of such authority was necessary in the public interest. This policy will remain in effect if the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to negotiate such leases is continued for the fiscal year 1948. In this connection, it should be noted that to date but approximately 50 leases have been entered into for a period exceeding 1 year. Without such authority, it doubtless would have been necessary in many cases either to accept undesirable space or to resort to condemnation or purchase to acquire suitable space.

Failure to continue the provisions of the second paragraph of section 100, supra, would seriously hamper the activities of the Veterans' Administration, particularly those re-

lating to the installation of out-patient treatment clinics. It would also probably result in an increase in the expenditure of public funds.

The conclusions stated in the preceding paragraph are based upon the following considerations. The Veterans' Administration is now excepted by the provisions of section 100, supra, from the restrictions imposed by the terms of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended, supra, which limit expenditures for alterations, improvements, and repairs of leased space to 25 percent of the first year's rental. This restriction under present market conditions would make it difficult to obtain space at a reasonable price, since in the experience of the Veterans' Administration, cheaper space costing, for example, 50 cents per square foot per annum would generally require a greater expenditure for alterations than higher-priced space costing perhaps \$3 per square foot per annum. Notwithstanding this fact, however, under the restrictions of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended, the Veterans' Administration could spend 75 cents per square foot for alterations on the more expensive space whereas on the cheaper space it could spend for alterations but 12½ cents per square foot. Consequently, when space is required for a long-term use, it would in many cases result in a substantial saving to the Government to acquire cheaper space and put it into condition for use. An estimate of gross savings which might be realized by the Government in this manner cannot be definitely determined but undoubtedly it would approximate many thousands of dollars. Further, in connection with the installation of medical clinics in leased premises, the Veterans' Administration is unable, because of the peculiar and extensive character of the alterations required, to make the necessary alterations for as little as 25 percent of the annual rental.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the proposed legislation be introduced and given early consideration for enactment.

Advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection by that office to the submission of the proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

OMAR N. BRADLEY,  
General, United States Army,  
Administrator.

#### RAMSEYER RULE

In accordance with the provisions of clause 2a, rule XIII, House of Representatives, the changes made in existing law by the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is in black brackets; new matter is in italics; existing law in which no changes are proposed is shown in roman):

Section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended:

Sec. 100. The Veterans' Administration is hereby declared to be an essential war agency and entitled to priority equal to the highest granted any department or agency of the Government in personnel, service, space, equipment, supplies, and material under any laws, Executive orders, and regulations pertaining to priorities. The Administrator is authorized, for the purpose of extending benefits to veterans and dependents, and to the extent he deems necessary, to procure the necessary space for administrative, clinical, medical, and out-patient treatment purposes by lease, purchase, or construction of buildings, or by condemnation or declaration of taking, pursuant to existing statutes.

Until [June 30, 1947] June 30, 1948, the Administrator is authorized to enter into leases or renewals of leases of property for any of the purposes specified in this section for periods not exceeding five years. The provisions of the Act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412), as amended by section 15 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1517; 40 U. S.

C. 278a), the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by the Act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1257), and the Act of February 27, 1906 (34 Stat. 48; 31 U. S. C. 665); and the provisions of section 3732 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 11) shall not apply to any lease entered into by the Administrator under the authority of this section. Nothing in this section shall be construed to diminish, or in any way limit any rights, power, or authority granted to the Administrator under any other law.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON LABOR BILL

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MICHENER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order to announce that the conference report on the labor bill which we propose to call up tomorrow will be called after the final action on the pending War Department appropriation bill if it is disposed of before 3 o'clock. If, however, that bill is not disposed of by 3 o'clock we will have the committee rise in order to act on the conference report on the labor bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. Is the gentleman still of the opinion that he could not give us more time than that? I thank the gentleman for his courtesy in giving us 3 more hours, but, frankly, I still do not think the Members are going to have time to read and digest this conference report in such a short time because they will only be able to get it in the morning.

Mr. HALLECK. I appreciate the gentleman's attitude, but as matters now stand I find it necessary to proceed with the program as I have outlined it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I was one of the conferees. The writing of the final bill shifted so rapidly over there that even I was not able to keep track of it. When will we get this report? Is it available now or is it just being printed now?

Mr. HALLECK. The report which has been filed will be in the RECORD in the morning. The bill as agreed upon was available to the extent of a few copies over the week-end and every Member had delivered to his office this morning a copy of this bill as agreed upon by the conferees, so they have had that in their possession available for study today.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would say to the gentleman I had a copy of that yesterday and I read it very carefully; that is, the proposed bill. But I was greatly interested in reading this conference report to see if I could find something in the report that would justify supporting the bill.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this morning I obtained unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an address delivered by

Bishop Charles B. Galloway of my State on the life and character of Jefferson Davis. I find that it exceeds the amount allowed, but I ask unanimous consent that it may be included regardless of the cost.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. KELLEY for 7 weeks, on account of appointment as substitute delegate and adviser to International Labor Organization Conference, Geneva, Switzerland.

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 4, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

731. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of a proposed transfer of a motor launch to the Junior Militia, Inc., of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Armed Services.

732. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to reimburse employees of the Department for expense of entertainment of representatives of other countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

733. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, recommending an amendment to section 17 (c) of the Federal Airport Act, Public Law 377, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

734. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of September 7, 1916, to authorize certain expenditures from the employees' compensation fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

735. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Caribbean Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

736. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government

agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

737. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 17, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on and a preliminary examination and survey of Polecat Creek, Creek County, Okla., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on July 23, 1941, and also authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 290); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with three illustrations.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2167. A bill to authorize the inclusion within the Angostura water conservation and utilization project of certain lands owned by the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 503). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WEICHEL: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 2721. A bill to amend the act of March 10, 1934, entitled "An act to promote the conservation of wildlife, fish, and game, and for other purposes," as amended by the act approved August 14, 1946; without amendment (Rept. No. 504). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BRADLEY: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3333. A bill to authorize the transfer of the *Joseph Conrad* to the Marine Historical Association of Mystic, Conn., for museum purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 505). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARTLEY: Committee on Education and Labor. Report pursuant to House Resolution 111, resolution authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction (Rept. No. 506). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHAFER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3049. A bill to continue in effect section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, relating to the exportation of certain commodities; with an amendment (Rept. No. 507). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3055. A bill to permit the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War to supply utilities and related services to welfare activities, and persons whose businesses or residences are in the immediate vicinity of naval or military activities and require utilities or related services not otherwise obtainable locally, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 508). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELSTON: Committee on Armed Forces. H. R. 3191. A bill to amend Public Law 301, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved February 18, 1946, so as to extend the benefits of the Missing Persons Act, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, to certain members of the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines; without amendment (Rept. No. 509). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 230. Resolution waiving points of order against title II of H. R. 3678, a bill making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 511). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 3700. A bill to provide for and fix the fees payable to the Patent Office and to amend sections 4884, 4931, and 4934 of the Revised Statutes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 3701. A bill to repeal that portion of section 203 of title 2 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, as designates the land herein described as available land within the meaning of that act, and to restore the land to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 3702. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to promulgate safety regulations to be observed in the operation of coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 3703. A bill to authorize transfer of surplus real property to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior for consolidation of Federal holdings within areas administered by the National Park Service; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 3704. A bill to exclude vendors of newspapers from certain provisions of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATHEWS:

H. R. 3705. A bill to provide a presumptive period of 2 years for certain diseases for World War II veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 3706. A bill to amend section 6 of the Reorganization Act of 1945; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 3707. A bill to extend for 1 year the time within which application may be made for benefits under the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 3708. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to make such act applicable to officers and employees of national farm-loan associations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3709. A bill to permit the Veterans' Administration to assist States, counties, and municipalities in the treatment of veterans suffering from tuberculosis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 3710. A bill to make the educational benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 available to the children of persons who died in active service or who died as a result of wounds received in World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. R. 3711. A bill to provide Federal aid to the States for the construction of armories and similar training facilities for the National Guard and Naval Militia; to the Committee on Armed Services.



By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution against adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of May 27, 1947; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. Res. 228. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 195; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GILLIE:

H. Res. 229. Resolution providing for an investigation with respect to the background and qualifications of persons considered for appointment as Superintendent of Police of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3712. A bill for the relief of Frank Loiacomo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 3713. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Judge E. Estes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMASON:

H. R. 3714. A bill for the relief of James Fred Girdley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

596. By Mr. BRADLEY: Petition of R. H. Simmons and 24 others, of the Eighteenth Congressional District of California, urging favorable consideration and passage of H. R. 969, which would increase the pensions of the Spanish-American War veterans and their widows by 20 percent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

597. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Charles R. Horton, Sr., Quinn, S. Dak., and 26 others, all members of Eastern Pennington County Cooperative Grazing District, asking that certain recommendations attached hereto be considered before any action is taken on H. R. 1692, which proposes disposition of submarginal lands acquired under the Bankhead-Jones Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

598. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Francis Jean Reuter, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to civil-service status; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

599. Also, petition of the membership of the Tampa Townsend Club, No. 19, Tampa, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

600. Also, petition of the membership of the Tampa Townsend Club, No. 35, Tampa, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

601. Also, petition of the membership of the Tampa Townsend Club, No. 15, Tampa, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

602. Also, petition of the membership of the Tampa Townsend Club, No. 8, Tampa, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 4, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met, in executive session, at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God, as we seek Thy guidance this day, we do not ask to see the distant scene, knowing that we can take only one step at a time. Make that first step plain to us, that we may see where our duty lies, but give us a push, that we may start in the right direction.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the legislative proceedings of Tuesday, June 3, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 135) to legalize the admission into the United States of Frank Schindler.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 617. An act for the relief of James Harry Martin;

H. R. 631. An act for the relief of the Allied Aviation Corp.;

H. R. 637. An act for the relief of Marvin Pettus;

H. R. 837. An act for the relief of the estate of Abram Banta Bogert;

H. R. 987. An act for the relief of Lorenzo H. Froman;

H. R. 993. An act for the relief of the estate of Norman C. Cobb, Naomi R. Cobb, and Garland L. Cobb;

H. R. 1144. An act for the relief of Samuel W. Davis, Jr., Mrs. Samuel W. Davis, Jr., and Betty Jane Davis;

H. R. 1152. An act for the relief of Mrs. Inga Patterson, widow of F. X. Patterson;

H. R. 1497. An act for the relief of the estate of George W. Coombs;

H. R. 1531. An act for the relief of William P. Gillingham;

H. R. 1658. An act for the relief of Norman Thoreson;

H. R. 1742. An act for the relief of Mary Lomas;

H. R. 1799. An act for the relief of Eva L. Dudley, Grace M. Collins, and Guy B. Slater;

H. R. 1851. An act for the relief of A. J. Davis, Mrs. Lorene Griffin, Earle Griffin, and Harry Musgrove;

H. R. 2302. An act for the relief of New Jersey, Indiana & Illinois Railroad;

H. R. 3170. An act for the relief of R. W. Wood;

H. R. 3387. An act for the relief of Bruce Bros. Grain Co.; and

H. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Roy Stanley Geiger, lieutenant general, United States Marine Corps, a commission as general, United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 565. An act to amend section 3539 of the Revised Statutes relating to taking trial pieces of coins;

S. 566. An act to amend sections 3533 and 3536 of the Revised Statutes with respect to deviations in standard of ingots and weight of silver coins;

S. 583. An act to authorize the exchange of lands acquired by the United States for the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project, Oregon, for the purpose of consolidating holdings therein, and for other purposes;

S. 993. An act to provide for the reincorporation of Export-Import Bank of Washington, and for other purposes;

S. 1022. An act to authorize an adequate White House Police force;

S. 1073. An act to extend until June 30, 1949, the period of time during which persons may serve in certain executive departments and agencies without being prohibited from acting as counsel, agent, or attorney for prosecuting claims against the United States by reason of having so served; and

H. R. 1. An act to reduce individual income-tax payments.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing sundry nominations in the Army, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### CONSULAR CONVENTION WITH THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate Executive Q. Eightieth Congress, first session, a consular convention between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines, signed at Manila on March 14, 1947. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the convention, and it will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The convention is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the consular convention between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines, signed at Manila on March 14, 1947.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the convention.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 4, 1947.

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State. 2. Consular Convention between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines, signed March 14, 1947.)